



South Dakota

Special Education Programs
FFY 2005 – 2012
State Performance Plan for Special Education

Division of Educational Services and Support
Special Education Programs
<http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped.aspx>

Revised January 2013

Table of Contents

Overview.....	3
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate.....	6
Indicator 2: Dropout Rate.....	15
Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Assessments.....	24
Indicator 4: Rate of Suspension and Expulsion.....	39
Indicator 5: Placement of Children Age 6 -21.....	46
Indicator 6: Placement of Children Age 3-5.....	53
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes.....	57
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement.....	77
Indicator 9: Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education.....	83
Indicator 10: Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality by Disability.....	93
Indicator 11: Evaluation Timeline.....	101
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition.....	105
Indicator 13: High School Transition.....	112
Indicator 14: High School Outcomes.....	118
Indicator 15: Timely Correction of Noncompliance.....	128
Indicator 16: Complaint Investigation Timeline.....	138
Indicator 17: Due Process Hearing Timeline.....	145
Indicator 18: Effective Resolution Sessions.....	153
Indicator 19: Effective Mediations.....	156
Indicator 20: Reporting Accuracy and Timelines.....	161

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012
--

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The South Dakota Part B State Performance Plan obtained broad stakeholder involvement throughout the process. This included:

- South Dakota's Special Education Programs Director attended the Office of Special Education Program's Summer Institute in Washington D.C. on August 10-12, 2005.
- Training on the State Performance Plan process for the Special Education Programs (SEP) staff, including the Special Education Programs Director and Educational Program Representatives, from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) in August 2005.
- Individuals in the Special Education Programs office were assigned to different indicators to collect and examine data.
- Identification of baseline data and materials necessary to complete the State Performance Plan.
- Collaboration with Part C Birth to 3 Connections state staff, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education and Special Education Program Consultant to provide technical assistance on the process of developing the State Performance Plan.
- An initial task-force workgroup was assembled to develop a State Performance Plan to be presented to the Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities for their input. This workgroup consisted of 24 people representing Special Education Programs Personnel, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education, Special Education Programs Consultant, higher education, local special education directors, education cooperatives, education service agencies, Transition Services Liaison Project, school psychologist association, the Council of Administrators of Special Education, Birth to 3 Connections, education specialists, and a private residential facility. The workgroup met initially in September 2005. This workgroup continues to meet on an annual basis as part of the initial review before presenting the State Performance Plan to Special Education Advisory Panel. The specific tasks requested of task-force group include:
 - Consider baseline and trend data for each indicator where such information was available;
 - Assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator where a target was required for the State Performance Plan;
 - Review the planned activities, timelines, and resources and provide input into the likely efficacy of the strategies proposed;
 - Suggest additional approaches for the Special Education Programs to consider including in the planned activities.
- In addition to the initial draft process undergone with the task-force group, the SPP was submitted to our broad stakeholder group, the Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities for their input, comments, and changes in October 2005. This process

continues annually with the updated presentation to the Special Education Advisory Panel in January of each year. The Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities is made up of parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, a representative from higher education, representatives from other state agencies, administrators, state and local officials, a representative dealing with transitional needs, and a representative from juvenile and adult corrections. A majority of the members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

- Along with stakeholder input, Special Education Programs personnel have continually participated in OSEP and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education's (TAESE) conference calls to gain more knowledge about the SPP process and indicators. TAESE has continued to assist Special Education Programs through calls and emails with this process. Special Education Programs staff plans to attend national and regional conferences on topics dealing with the State Performance Plan indicators in the future.
- To ensure statistically sound data, a minimum number (N) will be applied where appropriate. The necessity of applying a statistical analysis and a minimum N to certain target indicators was due to exceptionally small sample sizes. A minimum number large enough to provide both valid and reliable target determinations will be set for certain target indicators. South Dakota will be utilizing a minimum N to help ensure confidentiality of students in South Dakota public schools as well as to ensure statistically sound data. For all NCLB data South Dakota uses a minimum N of 10. Special Education Programs will follow South Dakota Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) protocol.
- Exception: Indicator 9 and 10 minimum N of 10 was changed to 20. Due to small numbers of students, the identification rates are often a result of the idiosyncrasies of that particular group of students and not the result of any policies and practices of the LEA. An analysis of the Weighted Risk Ratios based on n sizes of less than 10 can result in extremely high ratios due to having only 1 to 2 students in a particular racial/ethnic group that are given a lot of weight based on state enrollment figures. Thus, to ensure that the Weighted Risk Ratios were valid indicators of identification rates, a higher minimum n size was used. This change was put into effect with the FFY 2007 APR. This change was made based on stakeholder input after consideration of South Dakota data.
- Special Education Programs attended an evaluating strategies workshop in June 2011 to assist in states reviewing their improvement activities and creating strategies that will really improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Along with evaluating improvement strategies, states need to think about creating S.M.A.R.T goals. Beginning in FFY 2010 APR submission, improvement activities are either updated to reflect S.M.A.R.T. goal criteria or eliminated due to being embedded in the process or is not directly related to the indicator specific outcomes.

Public Reporting of the State Performance Plan and Annual Progress Report

- Following the submission of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report to the U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Programs will disseminate the State Performance Plan, Annual Progress Report (APR), and Local Education Agency (LEA) information in the following ways:
 - Post the final version and State Performance Plan, Annual Progress Report, LEA information and 618 tables on the agency website at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_SPP.aspx
 - Public Notices in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_SPP.aspx where the Annual Performance Report and updated State Performance Plan can be accessed. Hard copies of the reports will be available upon request. Newspapers printing the public notices are as follows: Sioux Falls Argus Leader; Aberdeen American News; Huron Plainsman; Pierre Capitol Journal and Rapid City Journal.
 - Alert constituency groups via existing list serves, email and workshops.
 - Presentation session at the State Council for Exceptional Children
 - South Dakota Parent Connection will announce publication of the Part B State Performance Plan on the Special Education Programs website in the newsletter so parents can access it.
 - Hard copies will be provided to all Districts/Agencies, Advisory Panel members, and Education Specialists and any individual making a request for one.
 - Hard copies will also be made available for public review at Department of Education, Special Education Program office. Public notice about the availability of the State Performance Plan will be made in a press release to major South Dakota newspapers.
 - Special Education Programs will be publicly reporting at the district level on the required indicators no later than May 15 of each year. Public reporting information on the State 618 data tables will also be available for those federal data tables that have been released. Access of this information can be found on the Office of Educational Services and Support, Special Education Programs website at the following link: http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_SPP.aspx .
- Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the

South Dakota Department of Education
Attn: Special Education Programs
800 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501-2294

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:Methodology for Calculating Graduation Rate:

South Dakota is currently building the database needed to calculate the graduation rate for all subgroups over a four year period based on the following schedule. School year 2002-2003 included 12th grade data only; school year 2003-2004 included 11th and 12th grade data; school year 2004-2005 included 10th through 12th grade data and in school year 2005-2006 full implementation with the inclusion of data for grades 9th through 12th grades.

The formula to be utilized is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{High School Completers in Year 4}}{\text{Dropouts (Gr 9, year 1 + Gr 10, year 2 + Gr 11, year 3 + Gr 12, year 4) + HS Completers, Year 4}}$$

This calculation is based on the recommendation of NCES in a publication "Public High School Dropouts and Completers from Common Core of Data: School Year 1998-99 through 1999-2000".

This rate will be reported and utilized for purposes of determining Adequate Yearly Progress for all students (in the aggregate) and reported for the disaggregated subgroups.

Definition of HS Completers (based on NCES recommendations):*High School Completers:*

- Diploma recipients – individuals who are awarded a high school diploma. This would not include students that may receive a non-standard diploma (e.g. a GED or certificate of completion).

Students with disabilities who complete the required coursework for graduation will receive a regular high school diploma. A student on an Individual Education Plan (IEP) who meets these criteria will be counted as a high school completer. However, students who are on an IEP who do not graduate in the standard number of years and who do not meet all required coursework for graduation will not be considered a high school completer.

Graduation Requirements

SD State Board of Education approved new graduation requirements at the November 15, 2004 meeting, but chose to delay implementation of the new standards until the 2006-2007 school year. Ninth graders entering high school in the fall of 2006 (graduates of 2010) will be the first class affected by the new requirements.

The new graduation requirements call for three curriculum paths -- currently referred to as Standard, Advanced and Distinguished.

- The Standard course of study includes raising the math requirement to three units and must include Algebra 1, adding ½ unit of Physical Education or Health, ½ unit of World History, and ½ unit of Economics or Personal Finance. In addition, students will take two units of any combination of World Language, Computer Studies or Career and Technical Education courses.
- The Advanced path includes all of the changes noted above, but it designates that the three units of math must include Algebra 1, Algebra II and Geometry. It also increases the science requirement from two to three units, which must include Biology and Chemistry or Physics.
- The third path, called the Distinguished path, follows the course requirements that students need in order to be eligible for the South Dakota Opportunity Scholarship.

State law SDCL 13-33-19 requires all students to complete the recommended high school program, called the “Advanced” path, but if a parent (or legal guardian) and the school agree that the student should take the “Standard” or basic curriculum, parents may sign a form that will allow the student to graduate meeting the basic high school program.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Graduation Rate of Students with Disabilities:	81.5%	[N = 540/663]
Graduation Rate for all Students	89.0%	[N = 8405/9440]

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The graduation rate for 2004-2005 for students with disabilities was 81.5%. This rate dropped from 2003-2004 where the graduation rate for students with disabilities was 87.29%. The graduation rate for all students in 2004-2005 was 89.0%. This rate also was a decline from 92.3% in 2003-2004 for all students. The change in graduation rate was effected by the change in calculation as noted below:

- 2003/2004- the total number of graduates divided by the total number of graduates plus the previous years 11th grade drop outs and the current year's 12th grade dropouts
- 2004/2005- 10th grade was added to the calculation
- 2005/2006- 9th grade will be added to the calculation

Special Education Programs does expect a drop in graduation rate again for the upcoming 2005-2006 school year since all grades 9-12, will be included in the calculation for the first time. South Dakota will be using that data as our baseline data to build our measurable and rigorous targets.

Data on the graduation rate for 2004-2005 reflects students with disabilities are graduating at a similar, although slightly lower percentage as compared to non-disabled students. The rates, however, when compared to the 2003-2004 data, reflect a drop in rates of graduation, both overall and for special education students. This can be explained by the change in the calculation formula for graduation.

Because of South Dakota's change in the calculation formula for graduation, we believe that there will be a small decline in graduation rates in 2005-2006. This decline will occur due to the addition of 9th graders in the calculation for the 2005-2006 school year.

Although, the graduation rates will drop slightly in South Dakota for FFY 2005, South Dakota will still increase graduation rates for students with disabilities by FFY 2010.

Actual Target Data for (FFY 2011) (2010-11 data):

South Dakota had a change in measurement for the 2011 Graduation Rate to ESEA graduation calculation for all students and subgroups.

ESEA Cohort Graduation Calculation is calculated by dividing the number of students who graduate in four years or less with a regular high school diploma by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for that graduating class. The following formula provides the four-year graduation rate for the cohort entering 9th grade for the first time

Number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the
2010- 11 school year

Number of first-time 9th graders in fall (starting cohort) plus students who transfer in, minus
students who transfer out, emigrate, or die.

Number of cohort members earned diploma in 4 years (2011)	535
Number of first time 9 th graders (2007-08)	950
Number, who transferred in	348
Number, who transferred out	459
Number, who emigrated or died	6

535

950 + 348 – 459 – 6

$$535/833 = .6423$$

$$.6423 \times 100 = 64.23\%$$

64.23% of Students with Disabilities graduated in 4 years

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	80% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2006 (2006-2007)	81% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2007 (2007-2008)	82% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2008 (2008-2009)	83% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2009 (2009-2010)	84% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2010 (2010-2011)	85% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma
2011 (2011-2012)	<p>85% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma</p> <p>South Dakota has changed to the ESEA graduation rate. The new target: 80% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school.</p>
2012 (2012-2013)	<p>85% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma</p> <p>South Dakota has changed to the ESEA graduation rate. The new target:</p>

	81.5% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school.
--	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
SEP will evaluate effective programs, strategies, and resources that encourage students to stay in and finish school through statewide and targeted professional development. Revised FFY 2008 APR	Fall 2008 and on going through 2013 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Special Education Programs staff, TSLP Staff, Office of Data Collection (OFM), National Dropout Prevention Center
When working with districts not meeting the graduation or dropout target, technical assistance and on-site monitoring staff will conduct interviews and review data and files to assist LEAs in determining appropriate strategies.	Spring 2008 and ongoing New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Special Education Programs staff, districts, Office of Finance and Management (OFM), Transition Services Liaison Project staff
Training will be provided on new graduation requirements and expectations for parents, staff and students concerning what coursework are required in order for students with disabilities to graduate with a regular diploma. (Emphasize at the IEP meeting)	Fall of 2006 and on-going through 2013 Completed- This activity is on-going and embedded in transition trainings	Legal counsel, Special Education Programs, Office of Civil Rights, Special Education Advisory Panel, Board of Education, South Dakota Parent Connection, Transition Services Liaison Project, Parent Resource Network
Provide graduation and post-secondary planning activities for at risk middle school special education students.	Fall 2006 and ongoing through 2013 Completed – Activity incorporated in transition trainings	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, guidance counselors, Special Education Programs, district special education staff, Vocational

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
		Rehabilitation staff
Collaborate with National Dropout Prevention Center to provide specific technical assistance, materials, trainings, etc... to 10 schools in reducing or eliminating dropouts.	Fall 2006 and on-going through 2013 Updated language FFY 2010 Completed in FFY 2011	TSLP and SEP staff, NDPC-SD, LEA data, Survey information, CEC Conference Board,
In order to improve the number of students with disabilities attending higher education and completion of a term, in conjunction with post-secondary disability coordinators, TSLP staff will host 4 Catch the Wave the wave events on post-secondary education campuses, yearly, across the state to provide students, parents, and teachers information about attending higher education, what to expect, and become familiar with disability coordinators and their services.	Spring 2006 and annually through 2013 Updated language FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, Special Education Programs staff, Voc Rehab, post secondary school representatives
Research indicates that students with disabilities, who participated in job skills training, are more likely to stay in school and be competitively employed. In FFY 2010, 407 students participated in project skills. By 2013, the number of students will participate in Project Skills will increase by 5%.	2005-2013 Updated language FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Special Education Programs staff, districts, Voc Rehab, Transition Services Liaison Project staff
According to NSTTAC predictors of success, career awareness and self-advocacy skills improve results in post-secondary education and	Summer 2006 and annually through 2013	Special Education Programs staff, Voc Rehab, Transition

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
employment along with staying in school. TSLP staff will conduct career leadership training for 40 high school students plus team assistants and leaders through the Youth Leadership Forum. Participants will become self-advocates, learn to set goals, and learn about career and community leadership opportunities.	Updated language in FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Services Liaison Project staff
In order to increase the number of files in compliance, the TSLP staff will conduct a Transition Institute yearly that train teachers on research based strategies to improve student outcomes: connect with adult agencies, administer and use transition assessments, and transition requirements of the law.	June 2006 and annually through 2013 Updated language FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, Special Education Programs, Vocational Rehabilitation
Technical Assistance and training on direct instruction and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS).	Winter of 2007 and annually through 2013 Activity is already included in Indicator 4 and 5	PBIS coordinator, RTI coordinator, Office of Data Collection, SEP, SEP funding
Disaggregate state level data by disability categories, ethnicity, and geographic regions and identify trends in data to inform improvement activities.	Fall 2007 and on-going Completed: Activity embedded in the process	Special Education Programs, advisory panel and Office of Finance and Management
Promote South Dakota "SD My Life" New in FFY 2009	Fall 2009 and on-going Completed: Included with new strategy in	Special Education Programs, TSLP, and Curriculum, Career and Technical Education Office (CCTE)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
	FFY 2011	
Dropout Prevention Coordinator will assist district in creating, implementing, and maintain dropout prevention plans through direct communication, regional meetings, and webinars.	August 2010 to August 2013	Special Education Funds
In order to assist districts in improving their graduation rate, SEP will research different options of support that will provide districts more direct dropout prevention assistance through surveying their needs, researching other states state level dropout involvement, and determine appropriate activity for South Dakota by December 2013.	December 2011 to 2013	Special Education Funds
Special Education Programs will research and promote self-advocacy curriculum and activities that can be incorporated into elementary, middle school, and high school levels.	New FFY 2011 Jan 2013 - Jan 2014	Resources: Parent Connection, Special Education Programs, Transition Service Liaison Project
Special Education Programs will partner and promote response to intervention model and strategies with school districts through the bi-monthly dropout calls, showcase on dropout prevention website, and dropout prevention trainings beginning in December 2013.	New FFY 2011 Jan 2013 - Jan 2014	Special Education Programs

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Special Education Programs will partner and promote PBIS initiatives, trainings, and strategies with school districts through the bi-monthly dropout calls, showcase on dropout prevention website, and dropout prevention trainings beginning in December 2013.</p>	<p>New FFY 2011</p> <p>Jan 2013 - Jan 2014</p>	<p>Special Education Programs</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:Definition of Drop-out

South Dakota Department of Education's Consolidated State Application Accountability workbook defines a dropout as:

An individual who

- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and
- Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and
- Has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program; and
- Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - Transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs);
 - Temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or
 - Death.

This definition is used in South Dakota for all students grades nine through twelve.

The State maintains a statewide student information system, called SIMS Net (Student Information Management System), where student data records are stored in a centralized data warehouse. Each student has been assigned a unique identifier that contains student demographic information and has the capacity for tracking the status and location of each student. The districts electronically enter dropout information via the Student Information Management System (SIMS) throughout the school year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- Special Education Youth Dropout rate: 5.03% [N = 4476/4713]
- All Youth Dropout rate: 3.57% [N = 42,873/44,458]

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data collected for the 2004-2005 school year reflects students with disabilities are reported as drop-outs at a similar, although slightly higher percentage than non-disabled students.

- The data for computing special education dropout rate is gathered through an analysis of accumulated special education enrollment for grades 9-12 divided by the accumulated special education enrollment for grades 9-12 plus total special education drop outs reported for grades 9-12. Then the number derived is deducted from 100 percent to get the percent of special education dropouts for current year. Accumulated enrollment for special education included any students who were on an IEP during the school year.
- The data for computing all youth dropout rate is an analysis of accumulated enrollment for grades 9-12 divided by the accumulated enrollment for grades 9-12 plus total drop outs reported for grades 9-12.

The total percentage of students who are leaving school prior to obtaining a high school diploma continues to represent a small percentage of students, both in special education and those not in special education.

The definition of dropout is the same as the NCLB Accountability workbook.

Revised Baseline Data for 2007-2008:

Due to the February 2009 SPP measurement changes to report dropout percentage based on the ESEA calculation, Special Education Programs revised the calculation and targets to reflect the change according to OSEP measurement changes and ESEA calculation.

- In order to meet the ESEA dropout data submission, South Dakota changed to a new dropout calculation which created a new baseline and setting targets.
- The data for computing special education dropout rate is gathered through an analysis of accumulated special education child count for grades 7-12 divided by the accumulated special education child count for grades 7-12 plus total special education drop outs reported for grades 7-12. Then the number derived is deducted from 100 percent to get the percent of special education dropouts for current year. Accumulated enrollment for special education included any students who were on an IEP during the school year.

Grades 7-12 Child Count = 6011

Grades 7-12 Dropouts = 116

$6011 / (6011 + 116) = 6011 / 6127 = 98.11$

$100 - 98.11 = 1.89\%$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (FFY 2007):

The original calculation included special education students enrolled in grades 9-12 and those that dropped out in that grade span. The new calculation now incorporates grades 7-12 students from child count. This is the calculation ESEA reported in 2007-2008 and our calculation and data reflect the ESEA data submission.

Even though South Dakota went to a new dropout rate calculation, South Dakota did meet the original target for FFY 2007 but has set new baseline and targets. As indicated in the Table 2-1, South Dakota retained more students even though including additional grade spans

Revised Baseline Data for 2008-2009:

In FFY 2008, slight changes occurred to the measurement for students with disabilities dropout rate. In FFY 2007, the number of special education dropouts was derived from the 618 Special Education Exiting Report. In FFY 2008, the number of special education dropouts was based on the ESEA dropout definition.

In FFY 2008, the calculation slightly changed from FFY 2007 (see above) to:

The data for computing special education dropout rate is gathered through an analysis of special education drop outs reported for grades 7-12 divided by accumulated special education child count for grades 7-12. Then the number derived is multiplied by 100 percent to get the percent of special education dropouts for current year.

Grades 7-12 Child Count = 5949

Grades 7-12 Dropouts = 197

$$197 / 5949 = .0331$$

$$.0331 \times 100 = 3.31$$

Note: Definition of a Dropout has not changed.

Table 2-1 indicates the changes in the calculation over the last four years. Even though in FFY 2008, the table shows a higher number of students with disabilities dropped out, the grade range has increased.

Table 2 - 1: Number and percentage of students included in dropout rate.

	Number Students Grades 9-12 Enrolled	Number of dropouts	Total enrolled including dropouts	Percentage of dropouts
2005-2006	4374	176	4550	3.9%
2006-2007	4262	181	4443	4.07%
	Number Students Grades 7-12 Enrolled	Number of Dropouts	Total Enrolled Including Dropouts	Percentage of Dropouts
**2007-2008	6011	116	6127	1.89%

***2008-2009	5949	197	NA	3.31%
*** New Dropout Rate Calculation in FFY 2008				

In the South Dakota Legislative Session 2007, the South Dakota State Legislature passed a bill requiring students (beginning in July 2009) to remain in school until 18 years of age. Districts are working on implementing strategies to keep students in school.

South Dakota Special Education Programs with assistance from Transition Service Liaison Project (TSLP is funded by Special Education Programs and Division of Rehabilitation to provide technical assistance on both programs to school districts, parents, and students), and the National Dropout Prevention Center have been engaged in providing dropout prevention activities to South Dakota schools. The State Performance Plan activities below indicate work being done to reduce dropout numbers.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	5% of students with disabilities are dropping out of high school.
2006 (2006-2007)	4.80% of students with disabilities are dropping out of high school.
2007 (2007-2008)	1.89 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school. This is a new calculation and baseline year.
2008 (2008-2009)	3.31 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school. (Baseline Change)
2009 (2009-2010)	3.31 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school.
2010 (2010-2011)	3.21 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school.
2011 (2011-2012)	3.21 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school.
2012 (2012-2013)	3.11 % of youth with IEPs are dropping out of high school.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

SEP will evaluate effective programs, strategies, and resources that encourage students to stay in and finish school through statewide and targeted professional development. Revised FFY 2008 APR	Fall 2008 and on going through 2013 Completed	Special Education Programs staff, TSLP Staff, Office of Data Collection (OFM), National Dropout Prevention Center
When working with districts not meeting the graduation or dropout target, technical assistance and on-site monitoring staff will conduct interviews and review data and files to assist LEAs in determining appropriate strategies.	Fall of 2008 and on-going Completed	Special Education Programs staff, districts, Office of Finance and Management (OFM), Transition Services Liaison Project staff
Provide career planning activities for at risk middle school special education students.	Fall 2006 and ongoing through 2013 Completed and updated in Career Planning activity in FFY 2010	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, guidance counselors, Special Education Programs, district special education staff
Strategies to increase graduation rates and decrease drop out rates will be created and training implemented for students, parents, and teachers.	Spring 2007 and annually through 2013 Completed	National Dropout Prevention Center, Transition Services Liaison Project staff, Special Education Programs staff, Parent Connection, district staff
Set up a database to be used by districts when entering student exit information (related to Indicator 14).	Spring 2006 (completed)	Special Education Programs staff, Bureau of Information & Telecommunications (BIT)
In order to improvement the number of students with disabilities attending higher education and completion of a term, in conjunction with post-secondary disability coordinators, TSLP staff will host four Catch the	Spring 2006 and annually through 2013 New strategy	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, Special Education Programs staff, Voc Rehab, post secondary school representatives

Wave the wave events on post-secondary education campuses, yearly, across the state to provide students, parents, and teachers information about attending higher education, what to expect, and become familiar with disability coordinators and their services.	created to focus on earlier interventions	
Research indicates that students with disabilities, who participated in job skills training, are more likely to stay in school and be competitively employed. In FFY 2010, 407 students participated in project skills. By 2013, the number of students will participate in Project Skills will increase by 5%.	2005-2013 Language updated 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Special Education Programs staff, district staff, Voc Rehab, Transition Services Liaison Project staff
According to NSTTAC predictors of success, career awareness and self-advocacy skills improve results in post-secondary education and employment along with staying in school. TSLP staff will conduct career leadership training for 40 high school students plus team assistants and leaders through the Youth Leadership Forum. Participants will become self-advocates, learn to set goals, and learn about career and community leadership opportunities.	Summer 2006 and annually through 2013 Updated language FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	Special Education Programs staff, Voc Rehab, Transition Services Liaison Project staff
In order to increase the number of files in compliance, the TSLP staff will conduct a Transition Institute yearly that train teachers on research based strategies to improve student outcomes: connect with adult agencies, administer and use transition assessments, and transition requirements of the law.	June 2006 and annually through 2013 Updated language in FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, Special Education Programs, Vocational Rehabilitation

	earlier interventions	
Technical Assistance and training on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Direct Instruction ○ Positive Behavior Intervention Supports 	Winter of 2007 and annually through 2013 Completed – This activity already exists in Indicator 4 and 5	Special Education Programs, Districts implementing PBIS
Training will be provided on new graduation requirements and expectations for parents, staff and students concerning what course work are required in order for students with disabilities to graduate with a regular diploma. (Emphasize at the IEP meeting)	Fall of 2006 and on-going through 2013 Completed and updated in Career Planning activity in FFY 2010	Legal counsel, Special Education Programs, Office of Civil Rights, Special Education Advisory Panel, Board of Education, South Dakota Parent Connection, Transition Services Liaison Project, Parent Resource Network
Collaborate with National Dropout Prevention Center to provide specific technical assistance, materials, trainings, etc... to 10 schools in reducing or eliminating dropouts.	Fall 2006 and on-going through 2013 Updated language FFY 2010 New strategy created to focus on earlier interventions	TSLP and SEP staff, NDPC-SD, LEA data, Survey information, CEC Conference Board,

Disaggregate state level data by disability categories, ethnicity, and geographic regions and identify trends in data to inform improvement activities.	Fall 2007 and on-going Completed - This activity already embedded in the process	Special Education Programs, advisory panel and Office of Finance and Management
Promote South Dakota “SD My Life” New in FFY 2009	Fall 2009 and on-going This activity is already embedded in career planning activity FFY 2010	Special Education Programs, TSLP, and Curriculum, Career and Technical Education Office (CCTE), Parent Connections
New FFY 2010: Provide district staff and parent knowledge of career planning (via graduation requirements, SD MyLife, post-school accommodations) with their students with disabilities, beginning in eighth grade through high school, to increase students with disabilities post-secondary goal with actual post-school activity one year after exiting.	Fall 2010 and on-going	Transition Services Liaison Project staff, guidance counselors, Special Education Programs, district special education staff, Office of Learning and Instruction
Dropout Prevention Coordinator will assist district in creating, implementing, and maintain dropout prevention plans through direct communication, regional meetings, and webinars.	August 2010 to August 2014	Special Education Funds
Special Education Programs will research and promote self-advocacy curriculum and activities that can be incorporated into elementary, middle school, and high school levels.	New FFY 2011 Jan 2013 - Jun 2013	Parent Connection, Special Education Programs, Transition Service Liaison Project

Special Education Programs will partner and promote response to intervention model and strategies with school districts through the bi-monthly dropout calls, showcase on dropout prevention website, and dropout prevention trainings beginning in December 2013.	New FFY 2011 Jan 2013 - Jun 2013	Special Education Programs
Special Education Programs will partner and promote PBIS initiatives, trainings, and strategies with school districts through the bi-monthly dropout calls, showcase on dropout prevention website, and dropout prevention trainings beginning in December 2013.	New FFY 2011 Jan 2013 - Jun 2013	Special Education Programs

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Assessment

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. (choose either A.1 or A.2)

A.1 AYP percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)}} \right] \times 100$.

A.2 AMO percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)}} \right] \times 100$.

South Dakota is choosing Option A.2.

B. Participation rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The State's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system process is aligned with NCLB and IDEA 2004 and includes state measurements of total population and all subgroups using a standardized test, setting cut scores, rigorous target goals, and measurement of yearly progress and reporting the progress to the public.

South Dakota will hold schools and districts accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14. Starting points, intermediate goals, and Annual Measurable Objectives will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools, and for districts /State. Every subgroup, school, and district grade span in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school Annual Measurable Objectives.

The starting point for reading was recalculated July 2005 to reflect changes in academic content and achievement standards as well as the assessment for reading. Annual Measurable Objectives were also recalculated, preserving the 100% proficiency requirement no later than the 2013-2014 school year. Likewise, the starting point for mathematics will be recalculated June 2006 to reflect the revisions to the mathematics content and achievement standards as well as the assessment for math. Annual Measurable Objectives for math will then be recalculated.

Annual measurable objectives for each grade span and subject area:

School Year	K-8		9-12	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002-2003	65%	45%	50%	60%
2003-2004	65%	45%	50%	60%
2004-2005	78%	54%	66%	67%
2005-2006	78%	65%	66%	54%
2006-2007	82%	65%	72%	54%
2007-2008	82%	72%	72%	63%
2008-2009	69%	72%	62%	63%
2009-2010	69%	72%	62%	63%
2010-2011	76%	79%	71%	72%
2011-2012	84%	86%	80%	81%
2012-2013	92%	93%	90%	90%
2013-2014	100%	100%	100%	100%

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Data has been retrieved using 3 years of standardized test data analysis which results in the following baselines. Baseline data for 2004-2005 will be available sometime in December. As soon as the data is available indicator 3 will be revised and updated. This will occur before January 5, 2006.

Districts Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for students with disabilities

Year	Total Number of Districts	Districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Reading	Percent of districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Reading	Districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Math	Percent of districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Math
04-05	165	165	100%	165	100%
05-06	165	163	98.79%	161	97.58%

Participation Rate

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2004-2005 Reading								
Grade 3	824	923	13	76	9	1836	1845	99.51%

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota

State

Grade 4	682	977	13	51	3	1723	1726	99.83%
Grade 5	575	930	14	59	5	1578	1583	99.68%
Grade 6	500	904	10	65	5	1479	1484	99.66%
Grade 7	407	960	7	70	4	1444	1448	99.72%
Grade 8	335	891	9	82	11	1317	1328	99.17%
Grade 11	252	476	9	48	10	785	795	98.74%
Total All Grades Assessed	3575	6061	75	451	47	10162	10209	99.54%

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2004-2005 Math								
Grade 3	825	922	13	76	9	1836	1845	99.51%
Grade 4	681	978	13	51	3	1723	1726	99.83%
Grade 5	574	931	14	59	5	1578	1583	99.68%
Grade 6	500	904	10	65	5	1479	1484	99.66%
Grade 7	407	960	7	70	4	1444	1448	99.72%
Grade 8	336	890	9	82	11	1317	1328	99.17%
Grade 11	252	476	9	48	10	785	795	98.74%
Total All Grades Assessed	3575	6061	75	451	47	10162	10209	99.54%

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2005-2006 Reading								
Grade 3	997	661	NA	63	14	1721	1735	99.19%
Grade 4	714	720	NA	90	7	1524	1531	99.54%
Grade 5	635	657	NA	80	3	1372	1375	99.78%
Grade 6	458	686	NA	91	10	1235	1245	99.20%
Grade 7	439	724	NA	82	11	1245	1256	99.12%

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota

State

Grade 8	398	691	NA	78	13	1167	1180	98.90%
Grade 11	319	338	NA	80	24	737	761	96.85%
Total All Grades Assessed	3960	4477	NA	564	82	9001	9083	99.10%

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2005-2006 Math								
Grade 3	1000	663	NA	63	9	1726	1735	99.48%
Grade 4	714	722	NA	90	5	1526	1531	99.67%
Grade 5	634	658	NA	80	3	1372	1375	99.78%
Grade 6	458	686	NA	91	10	1235	1245	99.20%
Grade 7	439	724	NA	82	11	1245	1256	99.12%
Grade 8	399	691	NA	78	12	1168	1180	98.98%
Grade 11	319	337	NA	80	25	736	761	96.71%
Total All Grades Assessed	3963	4481	NA	564	75	9008	9083	99.17%

Proficiency Rate:

2004-2005	Reading			Math		
	K-8	9-12	Combined Total	K-8	9-12	Combined Total
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment without Accommodations and Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4663	152	4815	3735	159	3894
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against alternate	296	29	325	289	35	324
Total Number of Special Ed. Students Proficient	4959	181	5140	4024	86	4110

Total Number of Special Ed. Students	9377	785	10162	9377	785	10162
Percent of Special Ed. Students Proficient	52.88%	23.06%	50.58%	42.91%	10.96%	40.44%

2005-2006	Reading			Math		
	K-8	9-12	Combined Total	K-8	9-12	Combined Total
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment without Accommodations	317	51	368	825	0	825
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3899	76	3975	2390	75	2465
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against grade level	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against alternate	170	28	198	98	11	109
Total Number of Special Ed. Students Proficient	4386	155	4541	3313	86	3399
Total Number of Special Ed. Students	8264	737	9001	8272	736	9008
Percent of Special Ed. Students Proficient	53.07%	21.03%	50.45%	40.05%	11.68%	37.73%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In 04-05, students with significant cognitive disabilities were tested using an alternate assessment aligned with alternate achievement descriptors. The state was able to measure their proficiency level against alternate achievement descriptors and thereby identifying some of those students as proficient for Adequate Yearly Progress calculations.

The State of South Dakota demonstrates a high rate of participation by children of disabilities in the state testing program according to the baseline data. The participation rate for students with disabilities has consistently been 97% for the past three years. Proficiency rates in math and reading prior to 2004-2005 did not allow proficiency measurement for students in alternate assessments. The number and percent of students with disabilities who were proficient or advanced in reading and math have been increasing since the implementation of the accountability model for NCLB. South Dakota continues to strive for increasing the achievement of students with disabilities in statewide assessment.

Data from state trends and national trends were used as rationale for setting target goals. Based on national averages, South Dakota continues to score above average in proficiency

levels in the disability subgroup. The 6 year target goals and annual increments were determined by using the annual measurable objectives for each grade span and subject area from the NCLB accountability workbook.

Revised Baseline Data for 2011-2012:

Due to the FFY 2011 measurement changes for 3A for states who have a approved Flexibility Waiver to NCLB, Special Education Programs revised the baseline data and reset targets to 3A and 3C to reflect the change according to the OSEP measurement and Flexibility Waiver calculations.

South Dakota submitted and had approved an ESEA Flexibility waiver in the 2012 calendar year. The waiver will take effect in the 2012-13 school year. The 2011-12 school year represents the baseline year upon which 2012-13 and subsequent targets will be set. South Dakota has adopted a School Performance Index (SPI) calculation which includes several factors in calculating an overall school and district score that is used for ranking purposes. The new accountability model takes a thoughtful, balanced approach to defining the indicators of a strong education system. Rather than focusing almost exclusively on student proficiency on a single assessment, it encompasses multiple indicators that are critical pieces in preparing students for the rigors of the 21st century world.

The new accountability system will continue to hold schools accountable through annual public reporting and classification based on a ranking of schools. The expectation is that the model will be used to inform school leaders, teachers and the public as to how schools are progressing. With its emphasis on continuous improvement, it sets a high bar for ongoing reflection and goal setting.

The new accountability system incorporates the following key indicators of school performance:

High School	Elementary/Middle School
1) Student Achievement	1) Student Achievement
2) High School Completion	2) Academic Growth
3) College & Career Readiness	3) Attendance
4) Effective Teachers and Principals	4) Effective Teachers and Principals
5) School Climate	5) School Climate

ANNUAL REPORTING

Each year, the Department of Education will calculate a School Performance Index score for each school in the state. The scores will be ranked and reported publicly. The SPI score will be used to determine schools for recognition purposes as well as for targeting interventions and support. Individual subgroup data and progress towards AMO goals and targets at the subgroup level will be reported annually.

The new School performance Index will be phased in as follows:

- **2011-12** Existing accountability model used for final year; no AYP determinations
- **2012-13** School Performance Index in place with the following indicators:
 - High School: Student Achievement, High School Completion, College & Career Ready
 - Elementary and Middle School: Student Achievement, Attendance

- State required to identify Priority and Focus Schools in fall 2012, per federal ESEA flexibility waiver
- **2013-14** School Performance Index based on same indicators as in 2012-13
- **2014-15**
 - **Add** Academic Growth Indicator at the Elementary and Middle School level
 - **Add** Effective Teachers and Principals Indicator at both levels
 - **Add** School Climate Indicator at both levels
 - **Reset** AMO targets and goals due to new assessment, then reset every six years

For the purpose of reporting Indicator 3 of the SPP/ARP, only the first Indicator focusing on student achievement will be used to report progress or slippage and set targets for 3A and 3C.

ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOs): Goals and Targets

The SPI score provides a broad first lens through which to view school performance. The new model also applies a second lens; this second lens is specific to Indicator #1: Student Achievement. It is at this level that AMO goals and targets are applied.

South Dakota's overarching goal is **to reduce by half the percentage of students (all subgroups) who are not proficient within six years**. Proficiency is measured by performance on the annual statewide assessment, just as it was under NCLB.

Targets based on this six-year goal, will be set for each subgroup at each school, in equal increments, to give that school a unique trajectory that recognizes where the school's various subgroups started in terms of student proficiency and to support continuous improvement. Targets will be set separately for reading and math. The 2012-13 school year serves as the base year for setting the six-year goal and annual targets. The same procedure is followed at the district level.

The baseline percentage of 9.38% was used by the stakeholder group to calculate targets based on the goal in the SD waiver to reduce by half the percentage of students (all subgroups) not meeting the proficiency target within six years.

To calculate the targets:

$100 - 9.38 = 90.62$ (difference of 100% and the current percent)

$90.62 / 2 = 45.31$ (difference in percent reduced by half)

$45.31 / 6 = 7.55$ (targeted reduction divided by six years)

7.55% annual percentage point increase on the base of 9.38% and increasing over 6 years

3A Targets for percentage of districts meeting both reading and math AMO

Baseline	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
2011-12						
9.38%	16.93%	24.48%	32.03%	39.58%	47.13%	54.68%

Calculation for 3C:

The process of determining baseline data and setting targets for 3C is similar to the process used for 3A.

To calculate baseline data on the students with disabilities subgroup for 2011-12, the percent of proficient students for math and reading were used and then calculations applied to reduce by half the percentage of students (all subgroups) not meeting the target within six years. In previous APR's the target was based on the AMO targets in the Accountability Workbook, for the 2011-12 year, South Dakota was waived from NCLB calculations therefore there was no longer a proficiency target and this is considered baseline data and targets would be calculated based on the goal to reduce by half the percent of students who are not proficient.

To calculate the targets for Math:

$100 - 42.17 = 57.83$ (difference of 100% and the current percent)

$57.83 / 2 = 28.92$ (difference in percent reduced by half)

$28.92 / 6 = 4.82$ (targeted reduction divided by six years)

4.82% annual percentage point increase on the base of 41.98% and increasing over 6 years

Math Proficiency Targets

Baseline 2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
42.17%	46.99%	51.81%	56.63%	61.45%	66.27%	71.09%

To calculate the targets for Reading:

$100 - 42.40 = 57.60$ (difference of 100% and the current percent)

$57.78 / 2 = 28.80$ (difference in percent reduced by half)

$28.89 / 6 = 4.80$ (targeted reduction divided by six years)

4.80% annual percentage point increase on the base of 42.22% and increasing over 6 years

Reading Proficiency Targets

Baseline 2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
42.40%	47.20%	52.00%	56.80%	61.60%	66.40%	71.20%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target			
2005 (2005-2006)	Indicators	Reading	Math	
	Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup	96%	96%	
	Participation rate for students with disabilities	97.7%.	98%.	

	Proficiency rate for students with disabilities	K-8	78%	65%	
		9-12	66%	54%	
2006 (2006-2007)	Indicators		Reading	Math	
	Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup		97%	97%	
	Participation rate for students with disabilities		98.2%.	98.4%.	
	Proficiency rate for students with disabilities	K-8	82%	65%	
		9-12	72%	54%	
2007 (2007-2008)	Indicators		Reading	Math	
	Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup		98%	98%	
	Participation rate for students with disabilities		98.7%.	98.8%.	
	Proficiency rate for students with disabilities	K-8	82%	72%	
		9-12	72%	63%	
2008 (2008-2009)	Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)		Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)		Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)
	96.1%		Reading	Math	Reading Math

		99.2%	99.2%	K-8 69%	K-8 72%
				9-12 62%	9-12 63%
2009 (2009-2010)	Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)	Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)		Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)	
	96.9%	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
		99.2%	99.2%	K-8 69%	K-8 72%
				9-12 62%	9-12 63%
2010 (2010-2011)	Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)	Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)		Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)	
	96.9%	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
		99.3%	99.3%	K-8 76%	K-8 72%
				9-12 71%	9-12 63%
2011 (2011-2012)	This is a new calculation and baseline year.				
	Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)	Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)		Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)	
	97% Baseline data – no target	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
		99.3%	99.3%	K-8 84%	K-8 86%
				9-12 80%	9-12 81%
				Baseline data – no target	Baseline data – no target

2012 (2012-2013)	(Baseline Change)				
	Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)	Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)		Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)	
	97%	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	16.93%	99.4%	99.4%	K-8 92%	K-8 93%
				9-12 90%	9-12 90%
				47.20%	46.99%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Collect and analyze data on statewide assessments. Special Education Programs will conduct annual analysis of student participation and proficiency rates as measured by Dakota STEP and Dakota STEP-A. This annual analysis will be used to identify problems and target technical assistance to districts	July 2006 – 2013 Revised FFY 2010, this activity as written completed	Technical assistance with National Center for Special Education Accountability & Monitoring (NCSEAM), Special Education Programs staff training
Special Education Programs will conduct annual analysis of student participation on Dakota STEP and Dakota STEP-A. This annual analysis will be used to identify issues and target technical assistance to districts that demonstrate a decrease or rate lower than the target participation rate.	June 2006 – June 2013	Technical assistance with National Center for Special Education Accountability & Monitoring (NCSEAM), Special Education Programs staff training
Professional development activities will be provided on aligning instruction to state standards, developing rigorous curriculum to meet those standards.	October 2005 & January 2006 and on going through 2013 Revised FFY 2010, this activity as written completed	Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), Access Center, Special Education Programs Staff
Professional development activities on aligning instruction to state standards and developing rigorous curriculum to meet those standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities will increase	Oct. 2005 – June 2013	Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), Access Center, Special Education Programs Staff, NCSC GSEG, U of NC – Charlotte

student access to grade level curriculum and improve results on the statewide alternate assessment.		
Federal, state, and district funding will be used for professional development to ensure instructors are highly qualified and trained in scientifically based researched materials, practices and programs.	Fall 2006 and on going through 2013 Completed FFY 2010	TAESE, Access Center, Special Education Programs Staff, Office of Curriculum Technology & Assessment (OCTA)
Educational Service Agency (ESA) systems comprised of seven regions throughout the state will focus on providing school improvement in the areas of reading and math.	2006 and on going through 2013 Completed FFY 2010	Special Education Programs staff, Education Service Agency Coordinators, OCTA
Examine regulations on the alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards. Begin development of modified achievement descriptors if the state elects to develop a modified assessment.	October 2007 to June 2010 Completed	Special Education Programs, Curriculum Consultant, local special education teachers, EAG and GSEG grant consortium partners
Collect and analyze data on statewide assessments.	Fall 2008 Completed	Special Education Programs, Office of Finance and Management
Revise activities and targets	Fall 2008 Completed	Special Education Programs
Update accommodation manual Conduct accommodation training	Fall 2007and ongoing	Special Education Programs

Conduct an accommodation study to verify IEP teams are providing instructional accommodations if they are also providing those accommodation on statewide assessment.	Spring and Summer of 2007 Completed	Peer Review Committee, Testing Advisory Council, Special Education Programs staff
Conduct a follow-up accommodation study to the study conducted in 2007 to verify IEP teams are providing assessment accommodations that are appropriate for the student's disability, used for instruction and documented on the IEP.	Spring of 2011 to Fall 2012 Completed FFY 2011	Testing Advisory Council, Special Education Programs staff, NCEO, Lange Research
SEP will examine ways to measure and show growth on alternate assessments based on alternate achievement descriptors.	Fall of 2010 and ongoing Completed FFY 2010	Testing Advisory Council, Special Education Programs staff, EAG grant collaborative members
Plan, develop and implement the transition from the state content standards to the common core curriculum and statewide assessment based on the common core.	Fall of 2010 and ongoing Completed FFY 2010	Testing Advisory Council, Special Education Programs staff, GSEG grant collaborative members and RTT grant collaborative members

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Indicator 4A

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for part A is defined as a district that suspends/expels more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities. For a district's rate to be considered, that district must have suspended/expelled at least 10 students. The numerator is the number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 days; the denominator is the district child count.

Indicator 4B

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for part B is identical to that for 4A with the exception of disaggregating the results by race/ethnicity. 4B is defined as a district that suspends/expels more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities. For a district's rate to be considered, that district must have suspended/expelled at least 10 students of that race/ethnicity. The numerator is the number of students with disabilities of a given race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days; the denominator is the district child count for that race/ethnicity.

Note: 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline, targets and improvement activities are to be provided with the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota has reviewed the Suspension/Expulsion data for FFY 2005. Special Education Programs has established the following new definition of “significant discrepancy” for suspension/expulsion for FFY 2005:

Indicator 4 A

South Dakota’s definition of significant discrepancy for part A means more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the district level with 2 or more students included in the numerator and the district child count included in the denominator.

$$\frac{\text{Students with disabilities suspended or expelled at the district}}{\text{Child Count at the district}}$$

For Indicator 4A Special Education Programs used the 2005-2006 data to compare the rates of students with disabilities (SWD) among the districts in the state to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. 1.80% of districts were identified by the South Dakota as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

$$3 \text{ districts} / 167 \text{ total districts} = 1.80\%$$

Baseline data for FFY 2004 is 1.80%.

Discussion of Part A:

In 2005-06, .6% of the districts in South Dakota had suspension rates of greater than 5% of their population of special education students.

The change in South Dakota’s definition of significant discrepancy makes longitudinal analysis unfeasible for FFY 2004.

Special Education Programs compared the rates of students with disabilities (SWD) among the districts in the state to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring. Please see the chart below.

District	Out of School 10 or greater	Total Child Count	Percentage	Met significant discrepancy
District A	1	376	0.27%	No
District B	1	373	0.27%	No
District C	8	1763	0.45%	No
District D	1	114	0.88%	No
District E	1	89	1.12%	No

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

District F	2	169	1.18%	No
District G	1	85	1.18%	No
District H	1	73	1.37%	No
District I	1	73	1.37%	No
District J	2	85	2.35%	No
District K	28	347	8.07%	Yes
Total	47	3547	1.3%	

Using Special Education Programs definition of significant discrepancy one district out of 167 total districts meets the criteria for having a significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities.

The district with significant discrepancies in suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities will be identified and will be required to have a review by SEP. This review will include a analysis of suspension/expulsion reporting procedures as well as reviewing the district policies, procedures and practices relating to implementation of Individualized Education Plans, procedural safeguards, and the use of positive behavioral interventions. The districts with significant discrepancies will hold a joint meeting with SEP to discuss district policies, procedures and practices. After review with SEP, if non compliance is identified, a corrective action plan will be required to address the significant discrepancies and will be corrected and verified within one year.

Indicator 4B

Baseline Data for FFY 2009:

Please note that South Dakota uses a data lag, so the FFY 2009 data is actually 2008-09 school year data.

Display 4B-2: Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2008-09 data):

Total # of LEAs	154
# of LEAs determined to have numerical significant discrepancy	0
% of LEAs determined to have numerical significant discrepancy	0.0%
# of LEAs found to have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures	0
Percent of LEAs that had significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures	0.0%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

No LEAs were identified as having significant discrepancy.

Display 4B-3: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

Year	Total Number of LEAs*	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent**
FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data)	154	0	0%

Display 4B-4: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Year	Total Number of LEAs*	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Percent**
FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data)	154	0	0%

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2009 using 2008-2009 data):

If any LEAs are identified with significant discrepancies, they will be required to analyze the district suspension/expulsion reporting procedures as well as reviewing the district policies, procedures and practices relating to implementation of Individualized Education Plans, procedural safeguards, and the use of positive behavioral interventions. The districts with significant discrepancies will hold a joint meeting with Special Education Programs to discuss district policies, procedures and practices. After review with Special Education Programs, if required the district will devise a plan to address the significant discrepancies with follow-up from Special Education Programs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A) 1.80% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population

2006 (2006-2007)	A) 1.80% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population.
2007 (2007-2008)	A) 1.20% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
2008 (2008-2009)	A) 1.20% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B)
2009 (2009-2010)	A) 1.3% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B) 0.0% of districts will have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures
2010 (2010-2011)	A) 1.3% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B) 0.0% of districts will have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures
2011 2011-2012	A) 1.3% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B) 0.0% of districts will have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures
2012 2012-2013	A) 1.3% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B) 0.0% of districts will have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Revise our suspension and expulsion data collection to include race and ethnicity for non-disabled students</p> <p>As data collection changes, SEP will update existing data collection to meet reporting requirement.</p>	<p>April 2006 and ongoing as needed for data collection reporting requirements change.</p>	<p>Special Education Programs staff, Factor 360 staff, Office of Finance and Management staff</p>

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
	Completed FFY2009	
Develop a training by webinar for all districts to participate which will demonstrate how to enter the data into the state suspension and expulsion system.	May 2009 Completed	SEP staff
Identify all districts with significant discrepancies and have the districts complete an analysis tool to identify reasons for significant discrepancies.	January 2006 and on going annually through 2013 Updated FFY 2010 part of identification process	Special Education Programs staff, district staff
All districts with significant discrepancies will review their policies, procedures, and practices in the district comprehensive plan.	February 2006 and on going annually through 2013 Updated FFY 2010 Part of identification process	Special Education Programs staff, district staff
Conduct professional development on the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports for all districts showing significant discrepancy.	October 2005 / on going through 2013	Special Education Programs staff, Sopris West
Examine the analysis tool to identify reoccurring reasons for suspension and expulsions.	January 2007 Completed	Special Education Programs
Target the areas of concern by providing professional development opportunities	Summer 2007 -	

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
and updating technical assistance information for districts.	2013	Special Education Programs, Sopris West
Form a partnership with Title programs to identify districts with significant discrepancies in both programs. Collaborate to provide Technical Assistance to identified districts.	Summer 2007-2013	Special Education Programs, Title programs
Increase the State PBIS leadership team to include representation from Head Start, Mental Health, more general education, and ESA leaders	Fall 2008 Complete	SEP
Form a partnership with ESAs to begin establishing an instate training network to increase the capacity of schools that can be trained.	Fall 2008-ongoing through 2013 Completed FFY2010	State PBIS leadership team
Provide opportunities for classroom teachers	Nov 2009-Nov 2013	SEP staff
Create Positive School Climates	Feb 2010-Ongoing	SEP staff, Bullying Organizations, PBIS
Behavior Training	Summer 2011 and ongoing	SEP staff, PBIS trainers

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:**

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.**
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.**
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.**

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

During the Individual Education Program (IEP) process, the IEP team determines that appropriate goals and objectives have been written, students are placed in the least restrictive environment according to the amount of time they are removed from the regular classroom setting. As part of the Accountability process districts review their policies and IEP procedures to ensure that placement is occurring in the least restrictive environment through the following questions:

- Placement in a specific special education program on the continuum of least restrictive environments (LRE) is determined after the support system for the child is designed.
- Removal from the general education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

- The school district provides an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate in the general education classroom, the general education curriculum, or extracurricular or other nonacademic activities.
- Consent from the parent is obtained prior to the initial provision of special education and related services to a student with disability.
- Children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled to the maximum extent appropriate;
- Children with disabilities are enrolled in the school he or she would attend if nondisabled, unless the IEP requires another placement;
- Removal from education in age-appropriate general classrooms is not done solely because of needed modifications in the general curriculum;
- The setting is determined after the needs, goals, and objectives for the children are determined;
- An array of services or a continuum of alternative placement options are available to meet the individual needs of each child;
- Placement decisions are made individually for each child;
- Consideration is given to any potentially harmful effects of the placement on the student or on the quality of services;
- The placement allows the child to participate with children without disabilities in nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities to the maximum extent appropriate;
- Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal from the general education classroom environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general classes cannot be achieved satisfactorily

The above Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) issues are then checked during the accountability cycle, which is done on a five year cycle at the district level. Districts annually submit placement data electronically through the Student Information Management Systems.

Instances of low performance on performance indicators (e.g., Indicator 5) are identified for each LEA. If a LEA's performance is less than the state established target for any performance indicator, the LEA may be required to develop a performance indicator improvement plan to improve progress toward meeting the state targets. A PIIP may be required to be developed in response to low performance on performance indicators.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Remain inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63%
B. Remain inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6%
C. Served in separate schools, residential placement, or home/hospital	4.5%

Special Education Placement Data – Ages 6-21		
School Age (ages 6-21) Settings		
	2004-2005	
Regular classroom with modifications	9,371	63%
Resource Room	3,862	26%
Self-contained classroom	959	6%
Day program	266	1.8%
24-hour program	381	2.6%
Home /hospital	20	.1%
Total # of children	14,859	

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data table above shows special education placement for students with disabilities ages 6 – 21. The percentage of students served in the regular classroom with modifications was 63% for the 2004-2005 school year. This setting has students with disabilities removed from the regular classroom setting less than 21% of the school day. Students with disabilities in the Self-contained classroom setting are removed from the regular classroom setting for more than 60% of the school day. 6% of South Dakota's students with disabilities are in this setting. South Dakota students with disabilities served in separate schools, residential placement, or a home/hospital setting make up 4.5% of the placements for 2004-2005.

- South Dakota is a very rural state and as a result, many school districts do not have resources available to handle extreme students. Many of our programs dealing with high needs students are located in two areas, the southeastern and southwestern part of the state where the state's largest population areas are located.
- South Dakota's Separate placement categories are 4.5% for 2004-2005. This is an area that Special Education Programs will be looking at over the coming year.
- South Dakota has been working to make sure that child find efforts are comprehensive statewide.
- Special Education Programs has worked with the University of South Dakota Center for Disabilities in funding intensive training in both autism and fetal alcohol spectrum disorders for school district personnel.
- Special Education Programs has also worked with Black Hills Special Services Cooperative to provide services that meet the needs of students identified with autism in western South Dakota.

- Some rural school districts have difficulty attracting highly qualified special education personnel and positions are open throughout the school year. For 2004-2005 school year there were 3031.20 special education personnel positions, 91.99 were contracted, 51.42 were non-authorized, 12.03 non-certified, along with 11 vacancies. When a student with an exceptional need comes into a small rural school district, the district may often have a difficult time hiring staff for the child who would be qualified to meet their needs. Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal from the general education classroom environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general classes cannot be achieved satisfactorily in the district. The IEP team only looks to place a student outside of their local district if the district can not provide the services or programs the student may need. South Dakota Special Education Programs will work to decrease this percentage through collaboration with the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality, higher education and continued support for school districts within the state.

According to the national average, South Dakota is ranked one of the top 10 states for placing students in the regular classroom who are removed from the regular classroom less than 21% of the day.

South Dakota will promote movement in the least restrictive environment by increasing the percentage of students in the regular classroom setting and decreasing the percentage of students in placements outside the regular classroom setting.

- Column A represents the percentage of students who are removed from regular education classroom less than 21% of the day.
- Column B represents the percentage of students who are removed from the regular education classroom greater than 60% of the day.
- Column C represents the percentage of students who are in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
2005 (2005-2006)	A. 80% >	B. < 40%	C. Separate
	64%	7%	4.3%
2006 (2006-2007)	64%	7%	4.3%
2007 (2007-2008)	65%	6.5%	4.0%

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

2008 (2008-2009)	65%	6.5%	4.0%	
2009 (2009-2010)	65%	6.5%	4.0%	
2010 (2010-2011)	66%	6%	3.8%	
2011 (2011-2012)	66%	6%	3.8%	
2012 (2012-2013)	66%	6%	3.8%	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
To provide training opportunities for both special education and general education personnel to effectively meet the educational needs of student in order for them to participate with their peers and be placed in the least restrictive environment.	Summer 2010-ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs, PBIS state leadership team and in-state trainers, RTI state leadership team and in-state trainers
In order to increase the number of students with behavioral disabilities in the general education setting and raise awareness about identification of such disabilities, South Dakota will develop and implement a one day behavior workshop that will focus on writing positive behavior plans as well as strategies to be implemented school wide to be presented in multiple locations across the state.	Summer 2010-ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs, PBIS state leadership team, In-state behavior team

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

In order to increase the number of students participating in the general education classroom, and reduce the number of inappropriate identification, SEP will develop a state level RTI team to coordinate implementation of a state wide RTI process.	May 2006 – on-going through 2013	Special Education Programs
Identify districts that have the lowest regular classroom setting percentage in order to track an increase in the number of students included in the regular classroom.	Summer 2006 and annually through 2013 On-going	Office of Finance and Management, National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring, Special Education Programs staff
Conduct training workshops for special education personnel on how to deal students with behavioral and emotional problems.	Summer 2007 – Summer 2011 Completed and revised to reflect Behavior Training/Behavior Institute	Special Education Programs, Crisis Prevention Institute
Provide training opportunities for the general classroom educators in identified districts, along with all districts, concerning modifications and accommodations, teaching strategies and disability awareness training.	Fall 2006 – Summer 2011 Completed and combined with additional PD activities to be more comprehensive in our efforts	University Training Programs, Special Education Programs, Educational Service Agency, Title, Office of Curriculum Technology and Assessment (OCTA)
Provide training opportunities for special education teachers in identified districts, along with all districts, on the process of the justification of placements and necessity of the Least Restrictive Environment.	Fall and winter 2006 – 2007 – Summer 2011 Completed and combined with additional PD activities to be more comprehensive in our efforts	Education Service Agency, Special Education Programs, University Training Programs
Train SIMS data person at the district level for Special Education	Spring 2006 – Fall 2011 Completed	SIMS person, Special Education Programs, Office of Finance and Management

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

Evaluate training of general and special education personnel and staff to decrease self-contained and separate placement and increase regular classroom placement with accommodations and modifications.	<p>Summer 2008 and Summer 2011</p> <p>Completed and determined necessary as part of the general process of providing professional development</p>	Special Education Programs, district staff
Work with districts to help recruit special education personnel in rural areas to work with students who have low incidence disabilities.	<p>Summer 2008/ on-going through 2010</p> <p>Completed</p>	Special Education Programs, South Dakota Higher Education, Teacher Quality
Develop and implement a special education endorsement which can be available to all teachers in South Dakota.	<p>Spring 2006 and ongoing through 2007</p> <p>Completed</p>	Special Education Programs, Special Education Endorsement Taskforce, Teacher Quality
<p>Office of Data Collection will develop a district reporting for children in the care and custody of the state.</p> <p>Department of Corrections and Department of Social Services Auxiliary Placement will be given an LEA and School coding in the EDEN system and SEP will report these students in Indicator 5 for the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Spring 2009</p> <p>Completed</p>	Office of Data Collection and Special Education Program Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:**

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and**
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Each school district reports through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) annually using the December 1 child count. The SIMS is the statewide online system used to collect information about all students in South Dakota schools. Districts submit data through the student data records. Each student has a 9 digit unique student identifier number. The unique student identifier number allows the SIMS system to collect and sort data without duplication errors. Each school district in South Dakota has a SIMS coordinator in place. The SIMS coordinator attends yearly training on the SIMS system.

During the Individual Education Plan (IEP) process, the IEP team determines that children who are in the Part B 619 program are served in the least restrictive environment.

- District procedures are in place for the smooth transition of children participating in the early intervention program who are eligible for participation in preschool programs under Part B. These procedures include all elements from ARSD 24:14:13:05. Transition from early intervention program.

- The district comprehensive plan has procedures in place to address the transition of children to the Part B program.
- All least restrictive environment (LRE) considerations are applied to preschool children with disabilities.
- If the school district/agency does not operate preschool programs for non-disabled children, the school district/agency meets the individual needs of preschool children with disabilities in LRE by providing some alternative settings, such as:
 - providing opportunities for participation in programs operated by other agencies;
 - placing preschool students in private school programs; and/or
 - locating classes for preschool children in elementary schools.

The above LRE questions are then validated during the monitoring cycle. Onsite monitoring for a district is conducted on a 4 year cycle. Districts annually submit placement data information electronically through the Student Information Management Systems.

Baseline Data for FFY 2011

Baseline and Targets in FFY 2011

A. Number of children aged 3 through 5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education services in the early childhood program: $571/2726 * 100 = 20.94\%$

B. Number of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. $457/2726 * 100 = 16.76\%$

Special Education Placement Data – Ages 3-5		
School Age (ages 3-5) Settings		
	2011-2012	
Regular Early Childhood Program – Special Education services in the EC program	571	20.94%
Regular Early Childhood Program – majority of special education services in	1546	56.71%

another location		
Separate Special Education Classroom	430	15.77%
Separate School	24	.01%
Residential Facility	3	.00%
Home	32	.01%
Provider Location or Other Location	120	.04%
Total # of children	2726	

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	South Dakota will maintain the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers at 20.94% (a) and maintain the number of students receiving services outside the regular early childhood preschool program at 16.76% (b).
2012 (2012-2013)	South Dakota will increase the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers to 21.45% (a) and decrease the number of students receiving special education services outside the regular early childhood preschool program to 16.26% (b).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline Data FFY 2011

The data table above shows special education placement for students with disabilities ages 3 – 5 during the 2011-12 school year. The percentage of students served in the regular early childhood program with majority of special education services in the classroom was 20.94% for the 2011-2012 school year. To address increasing the percentage of students receiving special education in the regular early childhood setting South Dakota has:

- been working to make sure that child find efforts are comprehensive statewide.
- been providing training and information on Least Restrictive Environments through monthly special education director meetings at least two times a year.

Due to South Dakota being a rural state, the numbers of available regular early childhood programs are limited. As you will see in the chart above the number of students in a regular education classroom less than 10 hours, but receive the majority of special education in another location is more dominant at 56.71%.

South Dakota will promote movement in the least restrictive environment by increasing the percentage of students receiving special education services in the regular early childhood program setting and decreasing the percentage of students receiving services outside the regular early childhood program setting.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
SEP will provide technical assistance and/or training/professional development to general education, special education professionals and collaborate with Part C to improve district systems and preschool least restrictive environments data quality at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year.	July 2012 - June 2014	Special Education Programs, Office of Finance and Management, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), and Part C Birth to 3 Connections Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who did not improve functioning)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who did not improve functioning)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In Part C, South Dakota currently evaluates all children in all 5 areas of development. Part C Birth to 3 Connections program began efforts to measure improvement in the five developmental areas (cognitive development, physical development including vision and hearing, communication development, social or emotional development, and adaptive development) in 2003. The program has been keeping track of the test scores in the developmental areas in the state database.

Beginning in March 2006 when children entered the Part B system South Dakota administered a post test in all 5 areas of development upon exiting Part C. When a child exits the Birth to 3 Connections program, the child is tested only in the area(s) of concern per Part B rules and regulations. The exit data for Part C will become the baseline data for children who become eligible for Part B. Children who enter the Part B (619) system after the age of 3 will be pre-tested in all 5 areas of development to establish baseline. Upon exiting the 619 program a post test will be administered in all 5 areas of development. The baseline pretest scores will be compared to the post test scores in the 5 areas of development evaluated to determine progress in the three required sub-indicators.

When evaluating a child exiting Part C and/or entering Part B (619) for outcome data reporting purposes, districts will evaluate children in each of the 5 areas of development on a norm-referenced standardized assessment tool. The state does not specify which tool(s) may be used but strongly recommends the use of the Battelle Developmental Inventory-Second Edition (BDI-2). The Battelle meets the requirements for collecting baseline data and can be used in conjunction with eligibility determination as one assessment instrument. Use of the Battelle will also allow for the continued tracking of longitudinal data on child development from Part C through Part B 619.

The state strongly recommends that the evaluators use the BDI-2. If different instruments are desired to be used then the evaluator (local school district) would need to show a cross walk on the instrument by a credited resource such as the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center.

Total standard deviation scores for each outcome will be entered into the data system. One complete set of scores will be determined and entered into the data system within 1 month of entering Part B 619 and prior to exiting for children who have been in the system for at least 6 months.

Part B 619 uses the total standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child to analyze the change in development from the BDI-2 at entry (time 1) to the BDI-2 at exit (time 2). With the publisher we will establish age level expectations for each outcome area for ages 6 months, 18 months, 24 months, and 36 months, etc. For each outcome area:

- a) If scores at time 1 and time 2 are both age level expectations, then children will be counted in priority (a). If scores at entry are below age expectations, but at exit they are at age level expectations, then the children also will be counted in (a).
- b) If scores at time 2 are higher than scores at time 1 (but not at age level expectations), they will be counted in (b).

c) If scores at time 2 are the same or lower than scores at time 1, then they will be counted in (c).

Measurement to address the different areas will be as follows:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship) will be calculated from the test scores that are received at the entry to the program and exit from the program in the areas of social/emotional development. This score will be calculated to determine the percent of children with IEPs who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, who improved functioning and who did not improve functioning.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) will be calculated from the test scores that are received at the entry to the program and exit from the program in the areas of cognitive/receptive communication and expressive communication. This score will be calculated to determine the percent of children with IEPs who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, who improved functioning and who did not improve functioning.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs will be calculated from the test scores that are received at the entry to the program and exit from the program in the areas of gross motor/fine motor/adaptive. This score will be calculated to determine the percent of children with IEPs who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, who improved functioning and who did not improve functioning.

All children who have exited the Part C and/or entered Part B (619) after 3-1-06 and who are enrolled for at least six months will be administered a pre and post test assessment using a norm-referenced standardized assessment tool such as the BDI-2. The pre test can be administered as part of the eligibility determination or will be given within 25 school days of entering the Part B (619) program. There is no strict timeline for administering the post test but it will be done fairly close to the time the child exits the Part B (619) system.

Data for the test will be entered into the Birth to 3 Connections data system by the state Birth to 3 Connections data manager at entry and exit from the Part B (619) program. For the initial assessment, the program will report the total number of items achieved in each outcome area as a standard deviation score. For the final entry when the child exits, the program will again enter the total number of items achieved in each outcome area as the standard deviation scores for that assessment date. The pre test and post test data will be submitted by district personnel on a state required form.

Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use will include:

- Annual training will be available to new practitioners and ongoing technical assistance will be available to Part B 619 providers through the South Dakota Education Service Agencies.
- In February 2006, Part B and C collaborated to provide a statewide training for the BDI - 2 in South Dakota. In January, 2006 a notice was sent to the 168 local schools districts

in the state on the change of testing requirements and the training for the BDI-2. Special Education Programs provided training in 3 areas in the state (Brookings, Rapid City, and Pierre). In March 2006, there was a BDI 2 training at the South Dakota Council for Exceptional Children Conference. This data provided the State the needed data for both Part B and C to address the child outcome indicators which are to provide the number of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, who improve functioning, and who did not improve.

Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure accuracy and completeness of the outcome data include:

- All data are entered into the Birth to 3 Connections data system by the State Birth to 3 Connections data manager. The State Part B 619 coordinator will review the test scores for accuracy and completeness and follow-up to verify if needed.
- For the 2006-2007 school year and forward Special Education Programs is utilizing the Battelle BDI Scoring Pro Web version online scoring and data collection tool. Each district will be able to enter data at the teacher level which will be accessible to SEP at the state level. The system is password protected.

Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance and outcome data analysis functions include:

- The data system has a section devoted to this endeavor. Currently, access to the data system is only permitted with credentials assigned by the lead agency and is limited to the five Birth to 3 Connections Part C staff and the data manager within the Bureau of Information & Telecommunications dedicated to the Department of Education. Part B will be working with Part C to continue data collection with the Birth to 3 Connections data collection system currently in place in order to ensure accurate longitudinal data can be obtained. The quality assurance manager with the assistance of the data manager for Birth to 3 Connections, and the 619 Coordinator completes the statewide analysis.
- The 619 Coordinator will have access to all local and statewide data. Access will be limited to only two state SEP personnel. The 619 Coordinator will continue to ensure the accuracy of the data through a yearly verification process with each district that will be due by July 1 of each year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

The following information is entry data from the BDI-2 for (A) positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); (B) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication; and (C) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. During March 1, 2006 to June 30 2006, BDI-2 entry scores for 460 children. The total standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child were used to determine the entry scores. The cut-off for each domain used to determine whether a child entered at age appropriate or below age appropriate is -1.5 standard deviations below the norm on the

BDI-2 scoring chart. This cut off was chosen because it aligns with the state eligibility criteria for qualifying for special education services. A score above -1.5 does not qualify a child for special education services so these children would be considered as comparable to same-age peers.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

	A. Positive social- emotional skills		B. Acquisition and use of knowledge skills		C. Use of appropriate behavior to meet their needs	
	-1.5 and above	Below - 1.5	-1.5 and above	Below -1.5	-1.5 and above	Below -1.5
	369	91	272	188	409	51
Percentage	80%	20%	59%	41%	89%	11%

In order to obtain the data necessary for indicator 7 of the SSP, South Dakota began administrating the BDI-2 to all children entering the program after March 1, 2006. A post test will be given as these children exit the program. In 2008 the pretest and post test scores will be compared to determine if progress was made. The entry scores for the children between March 1, 2006 and June 30, 2006 is being used as base line entry data. Baseline data will be established in 2010.

The table above indicates that:

- 80% of students with disabilities are entering the domain positive social-emotional skills at the same age level as peers.
- 59% of students with disabilities are entering the domain of acquisition and use of knowledge skills at the same age level as peers.
- 89% of students with disabilities are entering the domain of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs at the same age level as peers.

Annual training was provided to new practitioners and on going technical assistance will be available to early intervention providers. In January 2006 a notice was sent to the 168 local school districts in the state on the change of testing requirements and the training of the BDI-2. In February 2006 Part B and C collaborated to provide a statewide training for the

BDI-2 in South Dakota. Special Education programs provided training in three areas of the state. In addition, a fourth training occurred in September 2006.

This data will provide the state the needed information for both Part B and C to address the child outcome indicators on the State Performance Plan. In March 2006 the state will begin collection data in all developmental areas which will be translated into the required measures to determine baseline entry data.

2006-2007 Discussion of Data:

The data tables below indicate the number of students who began receiving services on or after March 1, 2006, received at least 6 months of services, and exited the program by June 30, 2007. As indicated in the 2005-2006 discussion, the cut-off for each domain used to determine whether a child entered at age appropriate or below age appropriate are -1.5 standard deviations below the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. If a child scored below -1.5 SD they were considered “not comparable to same-age peers.” The definition of “comparable to same-age peers” means a child has a standard deviation of -1.5 or above the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. This is the same definition as the state used in the SPP submission of February 1, 2007 and this current submission of February 1, 2008. This cut off was chosen because it aligns with the state eligibility criteria for qualifying for special education services.

Beginning January 2007, South Dakota activated the Battelle online Data Manager system. SEP staff and teachers began scoring all students using the online Data Manager scoring site.

- Teachers and SEP staff are responsible for entering students' scores into the online BDI-2 Data Manager scoring system. After entering students' scores into the online scoring system, staff must enter the student's program type into the Program Notes field (Entry C, Exit C, Transition, Entry B, Exit B, and/or NA - student not eligible, student not tested for progress monitoring purposes). This allows SEP to track students' progress from one program to the next.
- SEP exports the data from the online Data Manager scoring site and compares the students' entry and exit scores to determine students' growth and progress.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of Children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning (<i>Entry score is not higher than exit score using raw data</i>)	0	0.00%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. (<i>Increase in raw scores but not standard scores to reach level comparable to same aged peers</i>)	0	0.00%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. (<i>Increase in standard scores but not to a level comparable to same aged peers</i>)	2	8.33%

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Increase in standard score to reach level comparable to same aged peers)</i>	7	29.17%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged Peers. <i>(Maintained performance comparable to same aged peers using standard scores during entry and exit)</i>	15	62.50%
Total	24	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills(including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of Children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning. <i>(Entry score is not higher than exit score using raw data from both communication and cognitive domains)</i>	0	0.00%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Just below level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores from both communication and cognitive domains)</i>	1	4.17%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. <i>(Increased performance to level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores in only one domain communication or cognitive)</i>	6	25.00%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Increased performance to level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores in both communication and cognitive domains)</i>	10	41.67%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Maintained performance comparable to same aged peers using standard scores during entry and exit)</i>	7	29.17%
Total	24	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of Children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning. <i>(Entry score is not higher than exit score using raw data from both adaptive and motor domains)</i>	0	0.00%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Just below level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores from both adaptive and motor domains)</i>	3	12.50%

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. <i>(Increased performance to level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores in only one domain adaptive or motor)</i>	5	20.83%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Increased performance to level comparable to same aged peers using standard scores in both adaptive and motor domains)</i>	6	25.00%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. <i>(Maintained performance comparable to same aged peers using standard scores during entry and exit)</i>	10	41.67%
Total	24	100%

Regional trainings were provided and on going technical assistance will be available to early intervention providers.

- In January 2007, a notice was sent to all districts updating them with the new scoring procedures and requirements for the Battelle online Data Manager. Trainings were also provided highlighting the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the Battelle Developmental Inventory. Additional trainings were provided in September.
- In August 2007, 10 WebEx trainings were conducted to prepare new practitioners and update veterans with the new scoring procedures and program features of the BDI-2.

2007-2008 Discussion of Data:

Definition of “Comparable to Same-Age Peers”

The definition of “comparable to same-age peers” means a child has a standard deviation of -1.5 or above the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart.

The data tables below indicate the number of students who began receiving services on or after March 1, 2006, received at least 6 months of services, and exited the program by June 30, 2007. As indicated in the 2005-2006 discussion, the cut-off for each domain used to determine whether a child entered at age appropriate or below age appropriate are -1.5 standard deviations below the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. If a child scored below -1.5 SD they were considered “not comparable to same-age peers.” The definition of “comparable to same-age peers” means a child has a standard deviation of -1.5 or above the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. This is the same definition as the state used in the SPP submissions of February 1, 2007 through this current submission of February 1, 2009. This cut score was chosen because it aligns with the state eligibility criteria for qualifying for special education services.

Valid and Reliable Data

To ensure districts are submitting valid and reliable data, an emphasis has been placed on training district personnel on the targeted administration times, correct administration and scoring of the BDI2, using the state scoring site, and entering the procedure codes to track the reasons why the assessment was administered. Special Education Programs has setup an Early Childhood listserv to keep all personnel working with students in Part C informed of program information, updates, and training opportunities. SEP conducts multiple Live Meeting sessions for educators throughout the state. The training highlights the scoring features of the BDI2 online data manager system to ensure accurate reporting of early childhood data. In addition, SEP's 619 Coordinator, upon request, provides one-on-one technical assistance to teachers and school districts, demonstrating the scoring features of the online BDI2 program.

SEP has developed a Battelle Developmental Inventory Testing flowchart which assists educators in determining when the administration of the BDI2, for progress monitoring purposes needs to occur. SEP has also developed a BDI2 picture manual to support educators with the online scoring features of the BDI2. These resources and many others are posted on the Early Childhood webpage and sent out on the listserv. The picture manual has been posted on our website, disseminated through the early childhood listserv, and distributed at trainings and conferences.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number in each category using Proposed Definition	Percent in each category using Proposed Definition
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	9	3.69%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	14	5.74%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	39	15.98%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged Peers	182	74.59%
Total	244	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills(including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number in each category using Proposed Definition	Percent in each category using Proposed Definition
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	40	16.39%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	41	16.80%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	68	27.87%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged Peers	95	38.93%
Total	244	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number in each category using Proposed Definition	Percent in each category using Proposed Definition
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	19	7.79%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	32	13.11%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	54	22.13%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged Peers	139	56.97%
Total	244	100%

2008-2009 Discussion of Data:**Definition of “Comparable to Same-Age Peers”**

For FFY 2007, South Dakota defined “comparable to same-age peers” as a child who received a standard deviation score of -1.5 or above the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. This corresponds to a seventh percentile score. However, after receiving input from South Dakota’s stakeholder group for the FFY 2008 reporting period in addition to recommendations from the ECO Center, South Dakota has changed the definition of “comparable to same-age peers” as any child who received a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on the BDI2 scoring chart. This corresponds to the 10th percentile rank on the BDI-2 for a given outcome area.

(www.isbe.net/earlychi/pdf/ECO_recommendation.pdf)

The data tables below indicate the number of students who began receiving services on or after March 1, 2006, received at least 6 months of services, and exited the program by June 30, 2008. As indicated in the new the definition of “comparable to same age-peers”, the cut-off for each domain used to determine whether a child entered at age appropriate or below age appropriate are -1.27 standard deviations below the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. If a child scored below -1.27 standard deviations they were considered “not comparable to same-age peers.” The definition of “comparable to same-age peers” means a child has a standard deviation of -1.27 or above the norm on the BDI-2 scoring chart. This cut score was updated after careful consideration from stakeholder input and recommendations from the ECO Center.

Valid and Reliable Data

To ensure districts are submitting valid and reliable data, an emphasis has been placed on training district personnel on the targeted administration times, correct administration and scoring of the BDI2, using the state scoring site, and entering the procedure codes to track the reasons why the assessment was administered. Special Education Programs has setup an Early Childhood listserv to keep all personnel working with students in Part B informed of program information, updates, and training opportunities. SEP has conducted and recorded Live Meeting sessions for educators throughout the state. The trainings highlighted the scoring features of the BDI2 online data manager system to ensure accurate reporting of early childhood data. In addition, SEP's 619 Coordinator, upon request, provides one-on-one technical assistance to teachers and school districts, demonstrating the scoring features of the online BDI2 program. For FFY 2008 SEP contracted with Riverside Publishing to provide four onsite Battelle Developmental Inventory administration trainings throughout the State. The trainings focused on providing educators and practitioners with a hands-on experience involving appropriate and inappropriate testing practices. Additionally, SEP has been working closely with Riverside Publishing on creating new enhancements to the online BDI2 data manager system. The enhancements will provide a more efficient evaluation tool for educators.

Furthermore, SEP has created an "Early Childhood Outcomes Pamphlet entitled: What Parents and Providers Should Know" outlining outcomes information for educators and families. A Battelle Developmental Inventory testing flowchart, administration user guide, and picture manual have also been developed. These documents assist educators with the online scoring features of BDI2 data manager and determining when the administration of the BDI2, for progress monitoring purposes needs to occur. All technical assistance resources have been posted on our website, disseminated through the early childhood listserv, and distributed at trainings and conferences.

*A complete copy of South Dakota's revised SPP document is available on the state's website. http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_SPP.aspx

New indicator**Measurement:**

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of preschool children who did not improve functioning}}{\text{\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by } [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d)}] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = $\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus } [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)}] \times 100$.

The 10th Percentile Model

Baseline Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Display 7-1 shows the number and percentage of children in each progress category as well as the results of the summary statement calculations.

Display 7-1: Number and Percentage of Children in Each Progress Category and Summary statement Calculations

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children
a - Children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
b - Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	45	8.57%	119	22.67%	77	14.67%
c - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	39	7.43%	118	22.48%	75	14.29%
d - Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	121	23.05%	152	28.95%	115	21.90%
e - Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	320	60.95%	136	25.90%	258	49.14%
Total	525	100.00%	525	100.00%	525	100.00%
Summary Statements:						
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	78.05%		69.41%		71.16%	
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	84.00%		54.86%		71.05%	
Summary statement 1 calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$						
Summary statement 2 calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$						

Display 7-2: Summary Statement Results Over Time

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	2007-08	2008-09	2007-08	2008-09	2007-08	2008-09
Number of Children:	244	525	244	525	244	525
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	88.00%	78.05%	75.46%	69.41%	86.40%	71.16%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	88.11%	84.00%	61.07%	54.86%	74.18%	71.05%

Display 7-3: Targets (the targets for 2009-10 are the same as baseline and the 2010-2011 targets are higher than baseline by .5 percentage points)

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	78.05%	78.55%	69.41%	69.91%	71.16%	71.66%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	84.00%	84.55%	54.86%	55.36%	71.05%	71.55%

2009 – 2010 Discussion of data**Revisions (with Justifications) to Targets**

SD proposed targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 on the February 2010 SPP. This year, SD proposes to add the following targets for each outcomes area and each summary statement for FFY 2011 and FFY2012. The 2010-11 targets for Summary Statement 1 for Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills and for Taking Action to Meet Needs have been adjusted to a more realistic target. When the targets were set, SD essentially had one solid year of baseline data. Given two years' of reliable and valid data, SD believed that these two targets were set too high. SD met with a stakeholder group and determined what targets were achievable given the two years of trend data.

Display 7-4: Targets

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills			
FFY	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	78.05%	78.55%	78.65%	79.15%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	84.00%	84.05%	84.10%	84.15%
	Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills			
FFY	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	69.41%	64.39%	64.49%	64.99%

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	54.86%	55.36%	55.46%	55.96%
	Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs			
FFY	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	71.16%	66.50%	66.60%	67.10%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	71.05%	71.55%	71.60%	72.10%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Targets will be set in the February 1, 2010 APR
2006 (2006-2007)	Targets will be set in the February 1, 2010 APR
2007 (2007-2008)	Targets will be set in the February 1, 2010 APR
2008 (2008-2009)	See Targets in the Charts Above
2009 (2009-2010)	See Targets in the Charts Above
2010 (2010-2011)	See Targets in the Charts Above
2011 (2011-2012)	See Targets in the Charts Above
2012 (2012-2013)	See Targets in the Charts Above

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources 2007-2008:

During September 2008, Special Education Programs and the SPP/APR stakeholder workgroup evaluated each of the following activities below. These were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel in January 2009.

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Consultative services on data collection and analysis within each reporting category.	2008 through June 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Conduct training workshops for General and Special Education Early Childhood teachers and staff to highlight scoring features of Battelle Developmental Inventory online Data Manager scoring system.	Spring of 2008 through June 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	Special Education Programs staff and Riverside Publishing
Activities	Timeline	Resources
Collaborate with Part C Birth to 3 Connections Program to provide districts with training on testing requirements for the Battelle Developmental Inventory.	Spring of 2008 through June 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	Special Education Programs staff, Part C Birth to 3 Connections Staff
Activities	Timeline	Resources
A technical assistance scoring manual for the Battelle Developmental Inventory.	Spring of 2008 through June 2013 Completed June 2010	Special Education Programs staff and Riverside Publishing
Activities	Timeline	Resources
Provide workshop focusing on early literacy and language development skills within the early childhood classroom.	Winter of 2008 Combined with the next TA Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	Special Education Programs staff and Sopris West
Activities	Timeline	Resources
Provide training and Technical Assistance within the areas of early literacy development and implementation.	Winter 2008 through September 2013 Combined with the above early literacy Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below	Center for Early Literacy Learning (CELL)

Activities started in 2011

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Conduct an analysis of activities by district and student then disseminate to school	Jan 2011 - June 2013	Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence

districts.	Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	in Special Education (TAESE)
Activities Provide training for general education and special education early childhood teachers on analyzing data and how to use information to make programmatic changes.	Timeline Jan 2011 - June 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised indicator below.	Resources Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE)

Activities revised in FFY 10

Activities SEP will provide technical assistance/training/professional development to general education, special education, and collaborate with Part C to improve district systems, preschool outcomes and data quality at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year.	Timeline Jan 2011 - June 2013	Resources Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), Riverside Publishing, and Part C Birth to 3 Connections Staff
Activities SEP will provide technical assistance/training/professional development to early childhood professionals within the areas of early literacy development and implementation to improve preschool outcomes at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year.	Timeline Jan 2011 - June 2013	Resources Special Education Programs, Center for Early Literacy Learning (CELL), Sopris West (LETRS)

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The purpose of the Parent Survey is to assist the Special Education Programs unit in determining the extent to which schools are facilitating parent involvement. The survey data will assist the schools in improving parent involvement and will result in positive outcomes for parents as well as improved outcomes for children.

South Dakota used a paper-and-pencil, slightly-modified version of the 26-item National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Part B K-12 survey. A few items were modified in order to make the survey appropriate for parents of age 3-5 children. Each survey was identifiable to the school district. The Special Education Programs unit contracted with Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) for assistance with the data collection, data analysis, and report-writing for this indicator.

In July 2006, the Parent Survey was mailed to all parents of student's age 3-21 receiving special education services during the 2005-06 school year. Parents were asked to complete and then mail the survey to TAESE. Parents were assured of anonymity.

A total of 17,631 surveys were mailed and 1,406 were returned for a response rate of 8.0%. However, more than 200 of the surveys were returned due to a wrong address, so not all 17,631 parents actually received a survey.

Because of the low response rate, a random sample of 50 parents were called and asked five key questions from the Parent Survey. The responses of the phone interviewees were compared to the responses of those who completed and mailed the Parent Survey. A “percent of maximum” score based on the five items was calculated for each respondent. A respondent who answered each of the five items a “6” (Very Strongly Agree) received a 100% score; a respondent who answered each item a “1” (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the five items received a 0% score. A respondent who answered each item a “4” (Agree) on each of the five items received a 60% score. The mean percent of maximum score for the phone respondents (66%) was not significantly different from the mean percent of maximum score for the mail respondents (65%). Thus, the phone respondents were no more or no less satisfied than the mail respondents; as such, nonresponse bias is not present. This suggests that the results based on the mail respondents are representative of all parents of students with disabilities.

To address this indicator, Special Education Programs staff members reviewed the items on the written questionnaire to determine which of the 26 items related to the concept of the schools “facilitating parent involvement”. The staff members determined that all 26 items on the Parent Survey related to this indicator. Thus, each survey respondent received a percent of maximum score based on their responses to all 26 items. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “6” (Very Strongly Agree) on each of the 26 items received a 100% score; a respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “1” (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the 26 items received a 0% score. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “4” (Agree) on each of the 26 items received a 60% score. (Note: a respondent who **on average** rated their experiences a “4”, e.g., a respondent who rated 8 items a “4,” 9 items a “3” and 9 items a “5,” would also receive a percent of maximum score of 60%.)

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by size of district where the child attends school; (3) by the race/ethnicity of the child; (4) by the grade level of the child; and (5) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 88% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are white and 85% of special education students are white.

Then Special Education Programs staff members, with input from stakeholders, decided where to set the cut-score for determining that the school did indeed facilitate parent involvement. It was decided that a 60% cut score represented the most-appropriate cut score. A 60% cut-score is representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each item; as such, the family member is agreeing that school facilitated their involvement. The staff members did not believe it was appropriate to insist that respondents “strongly agree” (a cut score of 80%) or “very strongly agree” (a cut score of 100%) that the school facilitated their involvement in order for the respondent to be counted as someone who believes that the school facilitated parent involvement. Thus, any parent who had a percent of maximum score of 60% or above was identified as one who reported that the school facilitated his/her involvement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2005-2006):

The following table shows that 62.2% of parents reported that the school facilitated their involvement.

Percentage of parents who state that the school facilitated their involvement:

	School facilitated parent involvement
2005 (2005-2006)	62.2%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The first year of data collection indicates that the majority of parents believe that the schools facilitate their involvement; 62% of parents state that their child's school facilitated their involvement.

While this overall "parent involvement" percentage provides a benchmark of the extent to which schools are encouraging and facilitating parent involvement, the Special Education Programs unit has also reviewed individual item results to determine specific areas in which the schools and the unit can make improvements in how they communicate with and relate to parents of special education students. Districts will be given their survey results so that they might also target specific areas for improved parent involvement.

The Special Education Programs unit is concerned about the low response rate. The response rate of 8.0% is lower than desired. Even though the phone interviews suggest that nonresponse bias is not present, the department will be using a different survey distribution method during the 2006-07 school year in order to achieve a higher response rate. In spring 2007, the survey will be given to parents attending their regularly scheduled IEP meeting. Parents will be encouraged to complete the survey before or after the meeting, and to then immediately mail the survey to TAESE. This in-person distribution method should result in a higher response rate this year than last year. In addition, the survey instructions will specify that the Parent Survey is for parents of children receiving special education services and/or speech and language services. It was discovered that several parents of children receiving speech/language services believed that a "special education" survey did not pertain to them. This change should also result in a higher response rate.

The Special Education Programs staff members and stakeholders set the following targets. The target in FFY 2010 represents a significant difference from the starting point in FFY 2005.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	62.2%
2006 (2006-2007)	62.7%
2007 (2007-2008)	63.2%
2008 (2008-2009)	63.7%
2009 (2009-2010)	64.2%
2010 (2010-2011)	65.2%
2011 (2011-2012)	67.2%
2012 (2012-2013)	69.2%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: new indicator

Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Special Education Programs will contact each district with a low (below the state response rate) response rate from the Indicator 8 survey by letter with a follow-up phone call for any districts not responding.</p> <p>Districts will need to respond within 30 days of receiving the correspondence to explain what their procedure was for</p>	2007-2008 school year and ongoing.	Special Education Program staff will send and collect district response letters and determine if further SEP involvement is needed.

<p>distributing the Indicator 8 survey and how the district will improve the current response rate.</p> <p>Public reporting on the SEP website will include the district's low response rate.</p>		
<p>Special Education Programs will recognize districts with a response rate of 50% or greater that met the target on the Indicator 8 survey.</p> <p>Districts will receive a letter of congratulations and recognition on the SEP website.</p> <p>Districts will be honored at state special education conference with certificate.</p>	<p>2007 – 2008 school year and ongoing.</p>	<p>Special Education Program staff will send recognition letters and post on website.</p>
<p>Districts will send to parents/guardians of students with disabilities the survey with either the state form letter or their own.</p>	<p>Spring 2007</p> <p>Completed and identified as part of the annual process of this indicator</p>	<p>Special Education Programs will provide the survey and the return postage.</p>
<p>Special Education Programs will begin development of an optional online parent survey for districts to use as an option.</p>	<p>2008-2009 school year</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>Special Education Programs</p>
<p>Disaggregate and analyze district and state data to improve relations and parent involvement.</p>	<p>Spring of 2007-Spring 2011</p> <p>Completed and identified as part of the annual process of this indicator</p>	<p>Special Education Programs, Parent Connection, South Dakota Advocacy</p>
<p>A link for the NICHY Specific Disabilities will be added to</p>	<p>Fall of 2008</p>	<p>Information given to webmaster, SEP staff</p>

the Indicator 8 webpage.	Completed	
A monthly Special Education Directors call will focus on where to find disability information for parents.	Fall of 2008 Completed	SEP Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Each school district reports through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) annually. The SIMS is the statewide online system used to collect information about all students in South Dakota schools. Districts submit data through the student data records. Each student has a 9 digit unique student identifier number. The unique student identifier number allows the SIMS system to collect and sort data without duplication errors. The SIMS system does collect racial/ethnic information currently as well as data on related services by each student's unique identifier number; however Special Education Programs has not collected this information from data collection in the past. Special Education Programs will begin to collect this information in order to see if disproportionate representation exists. Each school district in South Dakota has a SIMS coordinator in place. The SIMS coordinator attends yearly training on the SIMS system.

Districts enter the required data currently on the SIMS. Special Education Programs collects this for their 618 data. South Dakota has elected to use the electronic spreadsheet provided by WESTAT to show potential disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in

special education and related services and to flag those districts. WESTAT is a federally funded research corporation consulting in statistical design, data collection and management, and research analysis work. Special Education programs and districts will then look closer to see if there is disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services based on inappropriate identification. Beginning the summer of 2006 NCSEAM will be assisting Special Education Programs in a data collection retreat. This will be a time set aside annually for Special Education Programs staff to review state and district data.

South Dakota has many small rural school districts. 26.1% of the districts in South Dakota have 200 or less student enrollment for grades K -12 and 48% have 201-600 student population for grades K-12. The largest category of student enrollment is comprised of Caucasian students at 84.6%, Native American students make up 10.8% of the public school enrollment followed by Hispanic students at 1.09%, African American students at 1.6% and Asian students at 1.1%.

Because the state has such small numbers of students, when broken out by race/ethnicity, it appears to report potentially significant numbers of students as being over and under identified in various disability categories and placements. The data points that are flagged could be the result of the small numbers being analyzed.

The appropriate identification, evaluation, and placement for children with disabilities is an ongoing training effort for the state agency. The state annually provides trainings and technical materials designed to ensure appropriate practices are in place. The state agency's compliance monitoring reviews the policies and procedures of each district during the school year's cycle for compliance monitoring with administrative rules governing evaluation, identification and placement procedures. If any district is identified with a compliance concern, individualized improvement plans are initiated to address any findings of noncompliance.

To ensure statistically sound data, a minimum number (N) will be applied where appropriate. The necessity of applying a statistical analysis and a minimum N to certain target indicators was due to exceptionally small sample sizes. A minimum number large enough to provide both valid and reliable target determinations will be set for certain target indicators. South Dakota will be utilizing a minimum N with this indicator to help ensure confidentiality of students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups in South Dakota public schools as well as to ensure statistically sound data. For all NCLB data South Dakota uses a minimum N of 10. Special Education Programs will follow South Dakota NCLB protocol.

South Dakota will identify districts with disproportionality that may be the result of inappropriate identification as follows:

- Stakeholder input will be received regarding the weighted and unweighted risk ratio formulas and the development of South Dakota's definition of disproportionate representation
 - Depending on Stakeholder input after seeing FFY 2004 baseline data South Dakota will decide upon whether to use a weighted or unweighted risk ratio
- Each district with any student cell size number of 10 or greater will be considered in the review process

- Using the WESTAT electronic spreadsheet, South Dakota will flag the districts with potential disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.
- Special Education Programs will study the data and determine which school districts have disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.
- Once districts are identified with the highest risk factor for disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services, an analysis of data will be conducted by Special Education Program staff along with local districts to see if the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services is based on inappropriate identification.
 - The analysis is conducted through an on site review by a team of SEP staff and education specialists. The team reviews the LEA's policies, practices and procedures, special education files, and conducts interviews with LEA staff.
 - Districts that have been found to have disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services based on inappropriate identification will develop a plan of correction.
- The district that has developed a plan of correction will receive additional technical assistance to correct the inappropriate identification procedures leading them to have disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

2007 Changes

SEP determined that any LEA who had numerical disproportionate representation would have an on-site review of its policies, practices, and procedures to ensure accurate and reliable information. Thus, the one district that was identified with disproportionate representation was reviewed. Upon an on-site review of the districts referral, evaluation, and eligibility determinations, it was determined that this LEA had disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 2.50 or above (over-representation) or .30 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 9-1: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification

Level	Weighted Risk Ratio
Over-Representation	2.50 and up
Under-Representation	.30 and below

2008 Changes

A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. Note that this represents a change from years' past. In the past, a minimum n size of 10 was used. However, with small numbers of students, the identification rates are often a result of the idiosyncrasies of that particular group of students and not the result of any policies and practices of the LEA. An analysis of the Weighted Risk Ratios based on n sizes of less than 10 can result in extremely high ratios due to having only 1 to 2 students in a particular racial/ethnic group that are given a lot of weight based on state enrollment figures. Thus, to ensure that the Weighted Risk Ratios were valid indicators of identification rates, a higher minimum n size was used this year.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation)). These cut-scores represent changes from last year. In prior years, the cut-scores were 2.50 and .30. South Dakota changed them this year because it was determined that districts with ratios of 2.50-2.99 were very unlikely to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. In fact, in FFY 2005, when a lower cut score was used and a much lower minimum n size was used, 14 LEAs were flagged, but none were found to have inappropriate identification practices. Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 9-2: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification**FFY 2011 Changes**

Due to changes at the Federal level states are no longer required to gather data from districts for the under-representation of students by race/ethnicity. South Dakota has removed the under-representation data collection piece for Indicator 9. Changes have been made to the chart below to reflect these changes. Under-representation has also been removed from the state's definition of Disproportionate Representation.

Level	Weighted Risk Ratio
Over-Representation	3.00 and up

Original criteria in 2006	Changes to criteria in 2007	Changes to criteria in 2008
Minimum N of 10 in special education race/ethnic group	Minimum N of 10 in special education race/ethnic group and comparison group more reliable and valid data.	Minimum N of 20 in special education race/ethnic group and comparison group more reliable and valid data.
Ages 3-21	Ages 6-21	Same as in 2007
Weight risk ratio at 2.0 and above	Weighted risk ratio using 2.5 or above for over-representation and .30 for under-representation	Weighted risk ratio using 3.0 or above for over-representation and .20 for under-representation.

Desk audit only	Data verification, desk audit, and on-site monitoring	Same as in 2007
<u>Original definition 2006</u>	<u>Change in definition 2007</u>	<u>Change in definition 2008</u>
Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.0 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in special education. 	Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in special education. 	Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionate representation refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 20 for overall numbers in special education.
<u>Original Activity 2006</u>	<u>Change in Activity 2007</u>	<u>Change in Activity 2008</u>
Inform districts that have been flagged and provide them with the analysis tool	LEAs that have been flagged at 2.5 or above will receive an on site visit.	LEAs that have been flagged at 3.0 or above will receive an on site visit.
Ensure districts found to have Disproportionality due to inappropriate identification for two consecutive years have corrected their identification process within one year of notification	No longer using two year rule. Districts are put on a plan of correction after the first year if they are found to have inappropriate identification procedures.	Same as in 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Stakeholder meetings were held in June and August 2006.

Membership included representation from:

1. Different educational backgrounds
 - Special Education Directors from schools and educational cooperatives
 - Educational Psychologist
 - Education Specialists
 - Assistant director educational cooperative
2. Small, medium, and large districts with diverse student populations.

This Stakeholders group was brought together to gain a basic understanding and make recommendations for South Dakota on determining appropriate information and data on districts when it comes to disproportionality due to inappropriate identification. The recommendations by the committee were the following:

- Definition of significant discrepancy: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education.
- 2.0 risk ratio factor
- Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in special education.

14 districts met the criteria were required to verify the numbers and submit explanations upon their examination of data.

SEP reviewed each district's data submission using the following rubric:

- Number still meets risk ratio
- Pre-referral process is weak and does not indicate adequate intervention and documentation.
- District does not provide services to another school or group that would cause disproportionate numbers.
- Overrides are greater than 5 or more and is disproportionate to other categories
- OCR compliant deals with inappropriate identification and no documentation of compliance.
- ELL students on IEP – Greater than 5 and weak documentation on procedures for determining placement.
- SLD identification due to social issues does not indicate appropriate procedures for dealing with the issue.
- Miscellaneous Info- data to explain disproportionate numbers is missing.

Districts found to have any concerns after the rubric analysis were completed were asked to submit additional data to SEP

Due to South Dakota's two consecutive years of concerns, Special Education Programs will review the districts' data in 2006-2007 and any district that had concerns in 2005 will be reviewed through on-site focused monitoring to ensure all policy, practice, and procedures are in compliance for appropriately identification of students. If any district is found out of compliance during the on-site visit for inappropriately identifying students in special education, they will be required to complete a self-assessment, develop a plan of correction and use 15% of early intervening services money.

Upon review of the 2005 process, Special Education Programs will need to reevaluate the initial criteria and desk audit process to include the following criteria:

- Initial Criteria
 - Minimum N of 10
 - Numbers should only include student ages K-12 due to:
 - LEA's can only use the early intervening services money toward K-12 students.
 - Review the districts with high Native American enrollment to White enrollment to determine if the Native American or White population is over represented.
- Desk audit
 - Improve process for collecting information
 - Clarify information needed from the districts
- On-site monitoring of districts with concern in the identification process will be incorporating into the new focused monitoring system beginning in 2006-2007 school year.
- Final development of self-assessment tool for districts in non-compliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

2008 (2008-2009)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Attend National Disproportionality forum in Denver, CO	Winter 2006 Completed	Special Education Programs
Call together a State level taskforce to define Disproportionality in SD, set targets, and determine the measurement tool to be used.	Summer/Fall 2006 Completed	Special education directors, special education teachers, coop directors, TAESE
Develop an analysis tool for districts to use to determine if the numerical Disproportionality is due to inappropriate identification	Summer/Fall 2006 Completed	State Disproportionality Taskforce
Inform districts that have been numerically flagged and provide them data to verify and the tool to review prior to	Fall 2006 and completed annually at the end of school through 2013	Special Education Programs

the SEP on-site visit.	Updated FFY2010 Part of Process for Disproportionality	
Provide TA to districts showing Disproportionality due to inappropriate identification	Fall 2006 and ongoing	NCCREST, Special Education Programs, TAESE
Develop a state level RTI team to coordinate implementation of a state wide RTI process	Fall 2006 and ongoing Completed	Special Education Programs
Stakeholder group will reconvene to update procedures for determining initial criteria and desk audit.	Spring 2007 Completed	Special Education Programs, NCCREST, and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education
Provide training on: Response to Intervention Procedures for accepting IEP Inclusion training dealing with accommodations and pre-referral activities.	Begin in the Fall 2007 and ongoing	Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education , Technical Assistance Centers
The Disproportionality taskforce will meet annually to review data, look at new information, address changes in SD criteria and provide guidance to SEP to address disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.	Fall of 2008 and ongoing through 2013 FFY 2010 Part of Disproportionality process	Special Education Programs, District Staff, Special Education Cooperative staff, SD Parent Connection, South Dakota Advocacy Services

Behavior Trainings	Summer 2011 and ongoing through 2013 Updated FFY 2010	Special Education Programs, PBIS state leadership team, In-state behavior team
PBIS in state training network	Summer 2010 and ongoing through 2013 Updated FFY 2010	Special Education Programs, PBIS state leadership team, In-state behavior team

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Each school district reports through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) annually. The SIMS is the statewide online system used to collect information about all students in South Dakota schools. Districts submit data through the student data records. Each student has a 9 digit unique student identifier number. The unique student identifier number allows the SIMS system to collect and sort data without duplication errors. The SIMS system does collect racial/ethnic information as well as a student's disability category by each student's unique identifier number; however Special Education Programs has not previously collected this information from data collection. Special Education Programs will begin to collect this information in order to see if disproportionate representation exists within specific disability categories. Each school district in South Dakota has a SIMS coordinator in place. The SIMS coordinator attends yearly training on the SIMS system.

Districts enter the required data currently on the SIMS. Special Education Programs collects this for their 618 data. South Dakota has elected to use the electronic spreadsheet provided by WESTAT to show potential racial/ethnic disproportionate representation by disability categories and to flag those districts. WESTAT is a federally funded research corporation consulting in statistical design, data collection and management, and research analysis

work. Special Education programs and districts will then look closer to see if there is disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories based on inappropriate identification. Beginning the summer of 2006 NCSEAM will be assisting Special Education Programs in a data collection retreat. This will be a time set aside annually for Special Education Programs staff to review state and district data.

South Dakota has many small rural school districts. 26.1% of the districts in South Dakota have 200 or less student enrollment for grades K -12 and 48% have 201-600 student population for grades K-12. The largest category of student enrollment is comprised of Caucasian students at 84.6%, Native American students make up 10.8% of the public school enrollment followed by Hispanic students at 1.09%, African American students at 1.6% and Asian students at 1.1%.

Because the state has such small numbers of students, when broken out by race/ethnicity, it appears to report potentially significant numbers of students as being over and under identified in various disability categories and placements. The data points that are flagged could be the result of the small numbers being analyzed.

The appropriate identification, evaluation, and placement for children with disabilities is an ongoing training effort for the state agency. The state annually provides trainings and technical materials designed to ensure appropriate practices are in place. The Special Education Programs compliance monitoring teams review the policies and procedures of each district during the school year's cycle for compliance monitoring with administrative rules governing evaluation, identification and placement procedures. If any district is identified with a noncompliance finding, individualized improvement plans are initiated to address any noncompliance findings.

To ensure statistically sound data, a minimum number (N) will be applied where appropriate. The necessity of applying a statistical analysis and a minimum N to certain target indicators was due to exceptionally small sample sizes. A minimum number large enough to provide both valid and reliable target determinations will be set for certain target indicators. South Dakota will be exploring the possibility of utilizing a minimum N with this indicator to help ensure confidentiality of students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups within specific disability categories in South Dakota public schools as well as to ensure statistically sound data.

South Dakota will identify districts with disproportionality that may be the result of inappropriate identification as follows:

- Stakeholder input will be received regarding the weighted and unweighted risk ratio formulas and the development of South Dakota's definition of disproportionate representation
 - Depending on Stakeholder input after seeing FFY 2004 baseline data South Dakota will decide upon whether to use a weighted or unweighted risk ratio
- Each district with any student cell size number of 10 or greater will be considered in the review process
- Using the WESTAT electronic spreadsheet, South Dakota will flag the districts with potential disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories.

- Special Education Programs will study the data and determine which school districts have disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories.
- Once districts are identified with the highest risk factor for disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories, an analysis of data will be conducted by Special Education Program staff along with local districts to see if the disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories is based on inappropriate identification.
 - The analysis is conducted through an on site review by a team of SEP staff and education specialists. The team reviews the LEA's policies, practices and procedures, special education files, and conducts interviews with LEA staff.
 - Districts that have been found to have disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories based on inappropriate identification will develop a plan of correction.
- The district that has developed a plan of correction will receive additional technical assistance to correct the inappropriate identification procedures leading them to have disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification.

2007 Changes

SEP determine LEAs who have numerical disproportionate representation would have an on-site review of their policies, practices, and procedures. Upon an on-site review of the districts referral, evaluation, and eligibility determinations, it was determine that one LEA had disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification.

South Dakota collects data for Indicator 10 through the state December 1 child count and fall enrollment i. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group for the six disability categories of Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Cognitive Disability, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech/Language Impairment. at each LEA is calculated. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 10 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 10 or more students in the comparison group.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Final Risk Ratio of 2.50 or above (over-representation) or .30 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 10-1: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification

Level	Weighted Risk Ratio
Over-Representation	2.50 and up
Under-Representation	.30 and below

2008 Changes

A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group for the six disability categories of Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Cognitive Disability, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech/Language Impairment at each LEA is calculated. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. Note that this represents a change from years' past. In the past, a minimum n size of 10 was used. However, with small numbers of students, the identification rates are often a result of the idiosyncrasies of that particular group of students and not the result of any policies and practices of the LEA. An analysis of the Weighted Risk Ratios based on n sizes of less than 10 can result in extremely high ratios due to having only 1 to 2 students in a particular racial/ethnic group that are given a lot of weight based on state enrollment figures. Thus, to ensure that the Weighted Risk Ratios were valid indicators of identification rates, a higher minimum n size was used this year.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation) These cut-scores represent changes from last year. In prior years, the cut-scores were 2.50 and .30. South Dakota changed them this year because it was determined that districts with ratios of 2.50-2.99 were very unlikely to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. In fact, in FFY 2005, when a lower cut score was used and a much lower minimum n size was used, 14 LEAs were flagged, but none were found to have inappropriate identification practices. Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 10-2: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification**FFY 2011 Changes**

Due to changes at the Federal level states are no longer required to gather data from districts for the under-representation of students by race/ethnicity. South Dakota has removed the under-representation data collection piece for Indicator 10. Changes have been made to the chart below to reflect these changes.

Level	Weighted Risk Ratio
Over-Representation	3.00 and up

Original criteria in 2006	Changes to criteria in 2007	Changes to criteria in 2008
Minimum N of 10 in special education race/ethnic group	Minimum N of 10 in special education race/ethnic group and comparison group more reliable and valid data.	Minimum N of 20 in special education race/ethnic group-disability group and comparison group more reliable and valid data.
Ages 3-21	Ages 6-21	Same as in 2007

SPP Template – Part B

South Dakota State

Weight risk ratio at 2.0 and above	Weighted risk ratio using 2.5 or above for over-representation and .30 for under-representation.	Weighted risk ratio using 3.0 or above for over-representation and .20 for under-representation.
Desk audit only	Data verification, desk audit, and on-site monitoring	Same as in 2007
<u>Original definition 2006</u>	<u>Change in definition 2007</u>	<u>Change in definition 2008</u>
Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education. • 2.0 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in special education.	Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education. • 2.5 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in special education.	Definition of Disproportionate Representation: Disproportionate representation refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services with a particular disability. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate for a particular disability group than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in that disability category. • 3.0 risk ratio factor • Minimum N of 20 for overall numbers in special education.
<u>Original Activity 2006</u>	<u>Change in Activity 2007</u>	<u>Change in Activity 2008</u>
Inform districts that have been flagged and provide them with the analysis tool	LEAs that have been flagged at 2.5 or above will receive an on site visit.	LEAs that have been flagged at 3.0 or above will receive an on site visit.
Ensure districts found to have Disproportionality due to inappropriate identification for two consecutive years have corrected their identification process within one year of notification	No longer using two year rule. Districts are put on a plan of correction after the first year if they are found to have inappropriate identification procedures.	Same as in 2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Number of districts initially identified	Category of concern	Number of districts doing further drill down of data.	Number of districts found out of compliance
21	Specific Learning Disabled	1	0
4	Speech	0	0
2	Emotionally Disturbed	1	0
3	Multiple Disabilities	0	0
2	Cognitive Disability	0	0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Stakeholder meetings were held in June and August 2006.

Membership included representation from:

1. Different educational backgrounds

- Special Education Directors from schools and educational cooperatives
- Educational Psychologist
- Education Specialists
- Assistant director educational cooperative

2. Small, medium, and large districts with diverse student populations.

This Stakeholders group was brought together to gain a basic understanding and make recommendations for South Dakota on determining appropriate information and data on districts when it comes to disproportionality due to inappropriate identification.

- Definition of significant discrepancy: Disproportionality refers to comparisons made between groups of students by race or ethnicity or language who are identified for special education services. Where students from particular ethnic or linguistic groups are identified either at a greater or lesser rate than all other students then that group may be said to be disproportionately represented in special education.
- 2.0 risk ratio factor
- Minimum N of 10 for overall numbers in the special education category.

SEP reviewed each districts data submission using the following rubric:

- Number still meets risk ratio
- Pre-referral process is weak and does not indicate adequate intervention and documentation.

- District does not provide services to another school or group that would cause disproportionate numbers.
- Overrides are greater than 5 or more and is disproportionate to other categories
- OCR compliant deals with inappropriate identification and no documentation of compliance.
- ELL students on IEP – Greater than 5 and weak documentation on procedures for determining placement.
- SLD identification due to social issues does not indicate appropriate procedures for dealing with the issue.
- Miscellaneous Info- data to explain disproportionate numbers is missing.

District found to have any concerns after the rubric analysis were completed were asked to submit additional data to SEP.

Due to South Dakota's two consecutive years of concerns, Special Education Programs will review the districts' data in 2006-2007 and any district that had concerns in 2005 will be reviewed through on-site monitoring to ensure all policy, practice, and procedures are in compliance for appropriately identification of students. If any district is found out of compliance during the on-site visit for inappropriately identifying students in special education, they will be required to complete a self-assessment, develop a plan of correction and use 15% of early intervening services money.

Upon review of the 2005 process, Special Education Programs will need to reevaluate the initial criteria and desk audit process to include the following criteria:

- Initial Criteria
 - Minimum N of 10
 - Numbers should only include student ages K-12 due to:
 - LEA's can only use the early intervening services money toward K-12 students.
 - Review the districts with high Native American enrollment to white enrollment to determine if the Native American or white population is over-represented.
- Desk audit
 - Improve process for collecting information
 - Clarify information needed from the districts
- On-site monitoring of districts with concern in the identification process will be incorporating into the new focused monitoring system beginning in 2006-2007 school year.
- Final development of self-assessment tool for districts in non-compliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: new indicator

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days or (State established timeline). South Dakota has a State established timeline of 25 school days.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 25 school days.
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 25 school days.

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Currently, districts gather data through student file reviews during the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan self assessment process. Their data collection includes:

- Number of initial evaluations conducted following receipt of parental consent
- Number of evaluations completed within 25 school day timeline
- Number of Eligibility/IEP meetings within 30 calendar days of receipt of last evaluation report.

This data is validated through on site monitoring visits.

South Dakota will continue to use their state established timeline of 25 school days to complete evaluations.

Special Education Programs will ask districts to submit annually by June 30th the following information:

- Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received for initial evaluation

- Number of children **not** determined eligible whose initial evaluations within 25 school days
- Number of children determined eligible whose initial evaluations were completed within 25 schooldays
- A narrative explanation for children whom consent to evaluate was received but initial evaluation or determination was not completed
- Range of days beyond the timeline when initial eligibility was determined (less than 5, 5-10, over 10 days)
- A narrative explanation of any reasons for the delays

Districts will submit this information directly to Special Education Programs through a state required form.

During Special Education Programs data retreat July 2006, district information will be analyzed in order to flag districts that have overdue evaluations.

- Using district provided information, Special Education Programs will diagnose why the district is showing overdue initial evaluations
 - If a district is showing overdue initial evaluations the first year, the district will need to review district data including policies, procedures and practices in referral, evaluation and eligibility determination.
 - If a district shows two consecutive years of significant overdue initial evaluations the district will be found out of compliance and a corrective action plan will be developed between the district and Special Education Programs.
 - The district will have 12 months to correct noncompliance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

	Number of Children	Number of Children with evaluations completed within timeline found eligible	Number of Children with evaluations completed within timeline found not eligible	Percent of children having initial evaluations completed within timeline
2005-2006	4202	3295	901	99.86%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Special Education Programs collected and disaggregated the data at district level. If there were any questions about student's evaluations not meeting the timeline, districts were contacted directly. Any discrepancies were verified, explained, and/or corrections were made.

4,202 children had parental consent to evaluate. South Dakota had 4,196 children whose evaluations were completed within timeline; there were only 6 children who did not have evaluations completed within the 25 school days. The factors dealt with 2 cases of student illnesses during testing window, 3 difficulties in scheduling of evaluators, and one case the parent and evaluator had difficulties scheduling and completing the evaluation with 25 school days. This gave South Dakota a percentage of 99.86%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2006 (2006-2007)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2007 (2007-2008)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2008 (2008-2009)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2009 (2009-2010)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2010 (2010-2011)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2011 (2011-2012)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days
2012 (2012-2013)	100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: new indicator

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop a Technical Assistance Guide/Frequently Asked Questions to guide districts in meeting timelines for initial evaluation, which addresses procedures for unusual circumstances	Summer 2007 Completed	Special Education Programs, Response to Intervention Team, District Special Education Directors

Districts that do not meet the 100% target will analyze data to determine reasons/trends and solutions to meet and ensure they will meet timeline within one year of notification.	Fall 2007 and ongoing Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	District Special Education Directors and district personnel
State will analyze state data and district self analysis to determine what resources or technical support needs to be provided.	Winter 2007/2008 and ongoing Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Special Education Programs, District Special Education analysis from Directors
Training on meeting timelines	Fall 2007 and ongoing Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Special Education Programs, Education Specialists

Activity revised for FFY 11

Activities	Timelines	Resources
SEP will provide training and technical assistance on meeting evaluation timelines for districts based on their annual indicator report, at a minimum of two times per year in order to maintain a high compliance rate.	April 2007-February 2013	Special Education Programs and Education Specialists

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services. e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays, |
|---|

<p>Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.</p>

<p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d- e)] times 100.</p>
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department of Education as lead agency for Part C funds nine local programs with 22 service coordinators who are responsible for specific counties, contract for service coordination at the local level to conduct child find, arrange for evaluations and develop Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs). Part C services are delivered by qualified personnel, for example community based agencies, school districts, and private contractors.

The transition from Part C to Part B starts when the child is two and a half years old. Service coordinators will make a written referral to school districts for the purpose of evaluations to determine eligibility. Local school districts conduct evaluations and determine eligibility for children who are referred from Part C to Part B preschool in cooperation with the local

service coordinator. The school district initiates the evaluation process following all procedural safeguards.

Transition to preschool program. Each local school district shall develop policies and procedures for the transition of children participating in the early intervention program under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) who are eligible for participation in preschool programs under Part B of IDEA.

Each district's policies and procedures must include the following:

- (1) A description of how the families will be included in the transitional plans;
- (2) Procedures to be used by the district for notifying the local network in which the child resides of the need for transitional planning;
- (3) Procedures for convening, with the approval of the family, a conference between the network, family, and district;
- (4) A requirement for convening the conference at least 90 days before the child is eligible for the preschool program under Part B of Individual with Disabilities Education Act; and
- (5) Procedures for reviewing a child's program options for the period beginning with the day a child turns three and running through the remainder of the school year including the development of an individual education program consistent with this article.

Each district shall participate in transition planning conferences arranged by the IDEA, Part C program.

The district shall provide the family with information on the eligibility and evaluation requirements under Part B of Individual with Disabilities Education Act, including the parents' and district's rights regarding procedural safeguards.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination

N = 583

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays

N = 135

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

N = 401

90 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

N = 90%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B Effective Transition Indicator #12		
Exiting Part C Programs	Measurement	2004-2005
Total Exits of 3 year olds	a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	583
Part B ineligible	b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	135
Part B eligible (on an IEP by 3rd birthday)	c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	401
Percent = c divided by a-b times 100.		90%

Eligibility testing for Part B preschool is offered to all parents transitioning out of Part C. Out of the 583 children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination 38 were not determined eligible by their third birthday. Parents refused Part B services for 9 more children. South Dakota has had a steady increase in the number of students served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. South Dakota also had a large increase in the number of children who were determined not eligible.

In an effort to ensure that children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday Special Education Programs has appointed a Part B 619 coordinator to work with Birth to 3 Connections staff on this important issue. In order to determine if noncompliance exists, further investigation is needed on the 38 children whose determination was not completed by their third birthday.

- A report has been developed indicating which children are exiting Part C so the Part B 619 coordinator can be in contact with district personnel that are not getting eligibility determination completed by the child's third birthday.
- An inquiry request is being developed to obtain information from district personnel to determine what valid and invalid reasons why an IEP was not in place by the child's third birthday.
- The Part B 619 Coordinator along with the Special Education Program regional staff will analyze the district information to determine if a finding needs to be issued to the district
- Districts with valid reasons why an IEP was not in place by the child's third birthday will not receive a finding.
- A letter will be sent to districts indicating that Special Education Programs has issued a finding of noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2012 (2012 -2013)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Special education eligibility guide will be updated to include the necessary evaluations for those students transitioning from Part C to Part B.	Summer of 2007 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Birth to 3 Connections, eligibility task force, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education , Special Education Program consultant
Continue to develop greater communication between Part B and Part C staff.	2006 and on going through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Special Education Program staff, Part C staff
Develop a Technical Assistance guide for districts addressing students transitioning from Part C to Part B.	Fall 2009 through 2010 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Part C staff, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education , Education Specialists
Part C staff will collect data monthly for all children who are Part B eligible, but who did not have an IEP in place by their third birthday. Part B 619 coordinator will contact districts to find out the reason for the IEP not being in place by the child's third birthday.	January 2006 through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Part C staff, Part B 619 Coordinator, district staff
Part B 619 coordinator will compile district information to determine valid and invalid reasons for the IEP not in place by the child's third birthday.	February 2006 and on-going through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Part B 619 Coordinator, district staff, Early Childhood Outcomes Center, Special Education Program Staff

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Provide early childhood transition data to district level administrators.	2009 and through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	SEP, Part C

Additional Improvement Activities 2009-2010: After reviewing 08-09 data, Special Education Programs and the SPP/APR stakeholder workgroup recommended the addition of the following activities.

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Work with NECTAC TA providers in setting up a training for Part C and Part B staff surrounding transition from Part C to Part B	2010 and ongoing through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	SEP, Part C, Part B, NECTAC
<p>Justification for new activity:</p> <p>This will provide Part C providers and district personnel with the opportunity to receive up-to-date training in the area of transition.</p>		

Activities	Timeline	Resources
Collaborate with Part C to enhance data collect from Part C to Part B	2010 and ongoing through 2013 Combined with several other Improvement Activities, see revised Activity below for FFY 11.	Part C, Part B,
<p>Justification for new activity:</p> <p>In order to provide a more efficient data collection Part C is automating their existing data system. Part B has been working closely with them ensure all measurements are being collected.</p>		

Improvement Activities revised for FFY 11

Activities	Timelines	Resources
SEP will provide technical assistance and training to Part B and Part C staff in order to increase reliable and valid data collected which will improve meeting transition timelines between Part C, families and school districts to part B service and meeting timeline for student's having an IEP in place by their 3 rd birthday.	September 2005 – February 2013	Special Education Programs, part C birth to 3 Connections, & NECTAC

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

During the 2007 -2008 school year, Special Education Programs (SEP) moved to an Accountability process for monitoring LEAs. SEP and Transition Services Liaison Project (TSLP) staff developed a Transition Self-Monitoring Process to obtain both Indicator 13 data and to improve student outcomes. About 30 to 35 school districts are required to submit transition aged files per year.

The process developed assisted districts to ensure that 100% compliance would be met by the LEAs that valid, accurate, and reliable data would be achieved, and appropriate transition plans would be created.

Step 1: District personnel are trained in utilizing the Indicator 13 checklist.

Step 2: District personnel use the Indicator 13 checklist as they complete transition IEPs for their students' **by** age 16 years.

Step 3: Districts identify which files to include in the district's self-assessment. Districts have some latitude in selecting the files, subject to the following guidelines:

- a. Provide a representative sample, by disability, of youth aged 16 and above.
- b. At a minimum, two I-13 checklists from each teacher of transition-aged students.
- c. 25% or 10 files, which ever is greater, for youth aged 16 and above.

Note: If district has 10 or fewer IEPs then all files will be submitted.

Step 4: Once all checklists are complete for the district's representative sample of disabilities for students 16 years and older, district will submit to Special Education Programs prior to **June 30.**

- a. Indicator 13 Checklist and attached copy of the IEP
- b. Prior notice or proof student was invited prior to the IEP meeting.
- c. Copy of consent to invite agency form (if applicable)
- d. Contact person for the district

Submit information to:

South Dakota Department of Education
Special Education Programs
Att: Melissa Flor
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Step 5: Special Education Programs verifies the reliability and validity of each checklists the district submits.

- a. Two reviewers fill out a feedback form for each IEP reviewed. The feedback form will be returned to district personnel.
- b. Special Education Programs may contact district personnel if there are questions or additional information is required.

Step 6: After SEP completes the checklist review process, districts are contacted:

- a. Districts receive feedback forms for all reviewed IEPs by **September 30,**
- b. Districts are given an opportunity to appeal concerns and to provide additional information showing that Indicator 13 requirements have been met
- c. Districts are notified if there are any compliance issues. If there are compliance issues, then a corrective action plan report will be sent to districts by **October 15.**
- d. Districts are notified of their Indicator 13 performance on the State Performance Plan which is publicly reported the following May.

Correction and Verification Procedures:

The districts received a copy of the feedback forms, and if applicable, a list of specific individual non-compliance findings. Districts were then given the opportunity to appeal, provide further documentation, and/or correct any individual files (prong 1) with non-compliance that was identified before the report was issued. The State would verify correction of individual files then review subsequent data (prong 2) to ensure the district is correctly implementing 09-02. If the district identified noncompliance and issued a finding they would verify correction by ensuring the individual student non compliance was corrected (prong 1) and review subsequent data to verify that the district was correctly implementing 09-02 (prong 2).

If a report is issued, district(s) are notified exactly which files contain errors, and, if applicable, any systemic issues through a corrective action plan. District staff is referred to the Transition Service Liaison Project regional staff for assistance in the correction of non-compliance through additional training. Individual files not meeting compliance standards are required to be corrected and resubmitted to monitoring personnel. For systemic issues, new individual education plans may be required to ensure continued compliance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

	2009-2010
Number of files that met the criteria	164
Number of files reviewed	213
Percentage	77%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

South Dakota has utilized the National Secondary Transition Technical Center Indicator 13 checklist since it was approved by OSEP. When requirements changed by adding 'student was invited' and 'the measurable postsecondary goals were updated', South Dakota's process did not change because our training incorporated those components of the law.

For FFY 2009, when the Indicator 13 review team evaluated the self-assessment documentation submitted in June 2010, 22 findings of non-compliance were identified. Districts were notified according to correction and verification procedures. All 49 individual instances of non-compliance was corrected and submitted to Special Education Programs for verification prior to report being sent.

This resulted in the FFY 2009 data to have a 100% of student files had a coordinated set of activities, goals, services to meet post secondary goals.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities

2006 (2006-2007)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Special Education Programs and Transition Service Liaison Project will provide 100% of districts in the Indicator 13 submission year with training and technical assistance to increase knowledge of transition regulations, promising practices, and increase compliance.	Fall 2006 and on-going (Language updated FFY 2010)	Mountain Plains Regional Resources Center, Transition Service Liaison
In order to increase the number of files in compliance, the TSLP staff will conduct a Transition Institute yearly that train teachers on research based strategies to improve	June 2007 and on-going (Language updated FFY 2010)	Transition Service Liaison, Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education

student outcomes: connect with adult agencies, administer and use transition assessments, and transition requirements of the law.		
Conduct on-site technical assistance through invitation or monitoring	Winter 2007 and on-going (Completed – Activity embedded in on-site monitoring)	Special education Programs and Transition Services Liaison Projects
Conduct workshops for teachers and train the trainers through South Dakota Council Exceptional Children (SDCEC conference) Workshops Regional trainings	Fall 2006 and on-going (Completed –Activity embedded in transition trainings)	Transition Services Liaison Project, Special Education Programs, and Education Specialists
Development of self-reporting system for districts.	2007 -2008 school year Completed	Special Education Programs and Transition Services Liaison Projects
Provide trainings on transition assessments and how it helps guide IEP transition services.	Fall 2008 and on-going (Completed –Activity embedded in transition trainings)	TSLP, SEP, and Educational Specialists
Tip Sheets through TSLP program on different transition paths	Summer 2008 and on-going Completed in FFY 2010	TSLP staff, SEP staff, transition interagency group, Department of Human Services
Provide training and professional development in utilizing different transition resources such as transition technical assistance guide, resource list, Catch the Wave, SD MyLife, best way to apply for SSI, and how to use Transition IEP to guide instruction.	Summer of 2009 and on-going (Completed –Activity embedded in transition trainings)	TSLP, SEP, South Dakota Advocacy, Parent Connections,

<p>New FFY 2010: In order to reduce the number of compliance issues related to high school transition files and improve post-school outcome data, SEP, TSLP, and Parent Connections will promote the use of the Transition Services Liaison Project website through trainings, webinars, and one on one interactions. The website will provide teachers, parents, and students knowledge of the transition process and resources.</p>	<p>Aug 2011 - July 1 2014</p>	<p>Transition Services Liaison Project, Special Education Programs, and Parent Connections</p>
<p>New FFY 2010: To reduce the number of district compliance issues related to invitation of outside agency and improve engagement in post-school outcomes, SEP, TSLP, and Parent Connections will provide a webinar and one to one training for teachers, parents, and students on various adult agency including contact information, resources, eligibility and options for each agency.</p>	<p>Aug 2011 - Aug 2014</p>	<p>Special Education Programs, Transition Services Liaison Project, Vocational Rehabilitation, Alliance for Full Participation group, Parent Connections</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14– *Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:*

- A. *Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.*
- B. *Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.*
- C. *Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.*
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: New Measurement

- A. *Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.*
- B. *Percent enrolled in **higher education or competitively employed** within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.*
- C. *Percent enrolled in **higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment** = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.*

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Five years ago the State of South Dakota did not have a process established for collecting the required data to satisfy the requirements for Indicator #14. However, due to the strong commitment from the South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE) and the South Dakota Special Education Programs (SDSEP), Black Hills State University (BHSU) in conjunction with the SDDOE/SDSEP and direction and consultation from The National Post-School Outcomes center (NPSO) a process has been developed and implemented to **collect the census** necessary data from the state's school districts and report the findings to the federal, state and local educational agencies.

South Dakota conducts a census survey of all leavers who graduate with a regular diploma, aged out, and dropped out. All exiters received a mail survey explaining what the survey entailed and why it was being done and asking them to return the completed survey. Those students not returning the survey were all contacted by phone and information was collected via phone survey

SDSEP has established a post-school outcomes database that contains student contact information and exit survey information to review the transition portion of the students' final Individualized Education Program (IEP), in addition to other information listed below. Information in this database does include the following:

- Student's name, address, telephone number, DOB, cell phone number etc.
- Year in which the student graduated
- Exit status e.g., regular diploma, aged out, GED, dropped out, etc.
- Race/Ethnicity
- Disabling Condition
- From final IEP: Anticipated post school outcomes-Employment/Education
- Adult Services linkages
- Participation status in statewide assessments
- English Language Learner
- Work/Volunteer status during last year of school
- Contact Information after leaving High School [**See Appendix A at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_transition.aspx**]

Information for each current year exiting student on an IEP was gathered by each individual school district in South Dakota. School Districts determined the most appropriate staff member to collect the exit information and submit to the secured website. This information is gathered prior to the student's exit from High School from May 15 to July 30. School districts supplied the required information from students on IEP's exiting the K-12 system in South Dakota during each school year.

Survey information is collected one year after student exits, approximately survey dates are April 1 through September 30, a telephone survey is conducted for students, who exited one year prior, either with the graduate or a family member of the graduate or school personnel. Additionally, prior to the actual survey, each student listed on the database receives a letter approximately one month before the phone survey began allowing the exiter to provide information via the mail vs. doing so with a subsequent phone survey. This letter informed the student/parent/guardian about the nature of the survey. Indicator #14 requires states to collect data for subsequent years, as well. The surveys completed between April 1-September 30 collect information related to post-secondary status and employment status. Information collected from the phone survey identifies how exiting students from each school year achieved their respective post-school goals in employment, post-secondary attendance and agency linkages. Information from the telephone survey included the following:

- Individual interviewed e.g., student, parent, guardian, school personnel
- Enrollment in any type post-secondary school or training program
- Whether student is currently enrolled in any post-secondary setting
- If not enrolled, explanation of why not
- Contact with an adult service agency e.g., VR
- Currently employed e.g., competitively, Military, Sheltered, etc.
- Name of Employer
- Number of hours worked
- Wages paid
- If not employed, explanation of why not
- Living arrangements e.g., home, apt, etc.
- Health Insurance coverage?
- Eight areas where the student may have had difficulty since leaving high school e.g., employment, living, education, finances, medical care, transportation, legal, social/leisure. **[See Appendix B at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_transition.aspx]**

This data will be used for program improvement at the SEA & LEA level. Goals can be developed at the state and local level to improve programs and outcomes, practices and procedures, cross agency coordination, collaboration and policy. The process of collecting data will allow individual districts to examine and use the data for program improvement and goal setting to increase post-school outcomes. The data collected from the school districts in South

Dakota will be reported by comparing information contained within this proposal as a baseline and comparing it to data collected from school districts during the phone surveys. Information collected from Appendix A & B will be reported per the Public Reporting Requirements for inclusion in each February 1 APR.

A statistical analysis utilizing computer software e.g., Excel and SPSS has been developed and will be incorporated into the final report for the South Dakota Department of Education & Special Education Programs. Outside consultation will continue to be utilized as necessary to appropriately interpret the findings from the data collected.

Additional information that has been collected from exiters has included the following:

- Include a section for the name of the person submitting the information(address, phone etc) so contact could be made for any further clarification of submitted data
- Include an option on the secured website that would require all requested information be provided before the school district entering the information can successfully submit the required data.
- Include a place on the secured website that a school can check (X) if they have no exiters/leavers from their school district for a particular year. e.g., available data suggest approximately 40 school districts in the State of South Dakota had no exiters/leavers on IEP's during the 2005-2006 school year.
- Include questions related to participation by the exiting student in the following activities:
 - Youth Leadership Forum
 - Self-Advocacy
 - Project Skills
 - Catch The Wave

Definitions

The following definitions are specific to the South Dakota's Part B Indicator 14:

Competitive employment means youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

*Dropouts defined: According to South Dakota Department of Education a dropout is defined as: An individual who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year and has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: transfer to another public school district, private school, or state-or-district approved educational program including correctional or health facility or temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or death.

Higher Education means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Other postsecondary education or training means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program). South Dakota's Technical Institutes would fall in this category.

Some Other Employment means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

Survey Response:

[illegible]

Bottom Line: If given addresses/phone numbers in Appendix A and using Sped Directors for the hard-to-find exiters we can collect representative samples of our exiting population (**54.3% Response rate overall e.g., 342/630 = 54.3%**)

Table 2 NPSO Response Calculator

South Dakota's Respondent Representation vs. its Target Leaver Representation in all categories suggest a representative response for the eight different categories within a +/- 3%

range. This suggests the data collected in all categories harvested is representative of all categories of the Target Leaver total. The first year South Dakota collected Indicator #14 data all categories were not representative. The first year of data collection, 2005-06, the categories of minority and dropout were underrepresented. Suggestions from a statewide task force group assigned to address this issue recommended contacting Special Education Directors and key school personnel in school districts with historically higher numbers of students in the minority (in South Dakota the largest minority is the American Indian at approximately 15-17% of the exiting population). This strategy was employed the following year, 2006-07, and the Respondent Representation was commensurate with the Target Leaver Representation and within the +/- 3% range in all categories. The following year Special Education Directors were not contacted and the response rate returned to baseline of 2005-06. This year, as stated before, the Special Education Directors were contacted and the response rate was within the +/- 3% range. This reversal design approach used to address Respondent Representation suggests involvement of Special Education Directors in collecting representative data of all leavers is a very effective tool in maintaining a +/- 3% response difference is a very powerful and effective intervention in the state of South Dakota.

Baseline Data from FFY 2009 :

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. *Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.*
A = 50/342 (total respondents) = 14.62%
- B. *Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.*
B = 50 + 176/342 (total respondents) = 66.08%
- C. *Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.*
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
C = 50 + 176 + 28 + 21/342 (total respondents) = 80.41%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data to be collected for the new Indicator 14 will replace the requirements mandated from previous years. In the past states have been required to collect exit data from students to determine if the student was employed only, attending Post-Secondary School only, or employed and attending Post-Secondary School only. The new indicator will also address each of these post-school outcomes, but greater emphasis is being placed on Post-Secondary School attendance followed by employment status. The following shows baseline data collected from the 2008-09 exiter population n=342:

Stakeholder Discussion:

Stakeholders reviewed post secondary outcomes data based on previous trend data along with the new measurement data.

Response Rate:

Stakeholders had discussion on including students in the contacted group. Many felt that teachers would be glad to assist in ensuring their student's information was provided in the survey. They felt that the state should continue to contact district personnel.

Discussion about definitions

Discussion regarding the technical institutes in the state were figured under the other postsecondary education or training category. Stakeholders felt that if these students were counted in the higher education, there would have been higher percentage in A.

When stakeholders were setting targets for 2012, they were concerned about how the current job market will have an impact and need take in account that the exiters that will be in contacted in the next couple years would not be affected by activities that will be implemented.

Stakeholders felt that more students could be attending higher education in the future. The targets are more aggressive in A then in B or C.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010) Baseline Year	2008-2009 Exiters surveyed in 2010
	A. 14.62% <i>Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	B. 66.08% <i>Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	C. 80.41% <i>Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</i>
2010 (2010-2011)	2009-2010 Exiters surveyed in 2011
	A. 14.62% <i>Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	B. 66.08% <i>Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	C. 80.41% <i>Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</i>
2011 (2011-2012)	2010-2011 Exiters surveyed in 2012
	A. 15% <i>Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	B. 66.25% <i>Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	C. 81% <i>Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</i>

2012 (2012-2013)	2011-2012 Exiters surveyed in 2013
	<i>A. 15.5% Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	<i>B. 66.5% Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</i>
	<i>C. 81% Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</i>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Improve Data Collection: Provide teachers, students, and parents information on the survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarification on definitions (completed FFY 2010) • Provide teachers and students the survey questions before they leave school. (completed FFY 2010) • Work with students to complete the forms. (completed FFY 2010) • Review Appendix A information at the exit IEP meeting and go over Appendix B survey. (completed FFY 2010) • Contact Case Manager for non-responders or hard to find students. (completed FFY 2010) • Encourage students to stay in contact with service agencies after IEP ends (completed FFY 2010). • Beginning in 2008-2009, SEP will analyze post-secondary employment and education of those students who attended Catch the Wave, project skills, and Youth Leadership Conference. • Provide data entry training every spring (completed FFY 2010) • Reviewing data entered into the online system in the fall to ensure all required data is completed for appendix A. (completed FFY 2010) 	2007 and on-going Completed FFY 2010	Special Education Programs TSLP staff BHSU
Post Secondary Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform students, teachers, and 	2007 and on-going	TSLP SEP

<p>parents about the type of accommodations that are allowed at post-secondary school. (completed FFY 2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Tip sheet for parents whose child plans to attend post-secondary. (completed FFY 2010) • Provide information on Post-secondary schools that assist or for student with disabilities. (completed FFY 2010) • Increase Catch the Wave participation for students, parents, and teachers. 	Completed in FFY 2010)	
<p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accurate information to teachers about vocational rehabilitation and order of selections. • Train on interviewing, applications, etc... • Create interagency collaboration and provide information to students, district personnel, and parents about the resources they provide. • Improve services or resources in the rural or small town setting. 	<p>2007 and on-going</p> <p>(Completed in FFY 2010)</p>	Vocational Rehabilitation SEP TSLP
Provide training on implementing self-directed IEP or self-advocacy training for teachers, parents, and students.	<p>2007 and on-going</p> <p>Completed FFY 2010: Embedded in new self-advocacy strategy</p>	TSLP SEP: Mini-grants Transition Summer Institute Youth Leadership Forum
NEW FFY 2010: In order to improvement the number of students with disabilities attending higher education and completion of a term, in conjunction with post-secondary disability coordinators, TSLP staff will host 4 Catch the Wave the wave events on post-secondary education campuses, yearly, across the state to provide students, parents, and teachers information about attending higher education, what to expect, and become familiar with disability coordinators and their services.	December 2009 to June 2013	TSLP, SEP, Disability Coordinators, Vocational Rehabilitation

SEP will collaborate with the National Post-School Outcomes Center four times per year until December of 2014 to improve data collection, reporting, and provide Indicator 14 data to districts to improve programming and outcomes for students with disabilities.	December 2009 to June 2013	SEP, NPSO, TSLP
Increase self-advocacy opportunities for students with disabilities through implementation of self-advocacy curriculum in districts, providing training on and implementing self-directed IEP or self-advocacy training for teachers, parents, and students.	December 2009 to June 2013	SEP, TSLP, district staff
SEP staff will collaborate with Office of Career and Technical Education (OCTE) staff quarterly to increase students with disabilities opportunities to participate in career awareness activities, access SD MyLife, and to observe and gain hands-on experience in how business and industry work related to the student's chosen career pathway.	December 2009 to June 2013	SEP, OCTE, VR, TSLP
To reduce the number of district compliance issues related to invitation of outside agency and improve engagement in post-school outcomes, SEP, TSLP, and Parent Connections will provide a webinar and one to one training for teachers, parents, and students on various adult agency including contact information, resources, eligibility and options for each agency.	December 2009 to June 2013	Special Education Programs, Transition Services Liaison Project, Vocational Rehabilitation, Alliance for Full Participation group
New FFY 2011: SEP will collect data, identify areas of concern, research and promote strategies to improve students with disabilities participation in higher education by March 1, 2014.	Jan 2013 - Apr 2014	Special Education Programs, Disability Coordinators, Parent Connection, National Post-School Outcomes Center

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota is on a five year monitoring cycle where 1/5th of the school districts are monitored annually. This involves approximately 35 districts per year.

Currently, South Dakota's monitoring revolves around six principles. Principle 1 General Supervision has seven sub-categories: child find, referral procedures, children voluntarily enrolled by parents in private schools, students placed by the school district in private schools, improving results through performance goals and indicators, suspension and expulsion rates, personnel and professional development. Principle 2 Free Appropriate Public Education has two sub-categories: FAPE and suspension/expulsion. Principle 3 has five sub-categories: comprehensive evaluation, written Notice and consent for evaluation, evaluation procedures and instruments, eligibility determination, and reevaluation and continuing eligibility. Principle 4 has six sub-categories: procedural safeguards notice, surrogate parents, consent, confidentiality and access to records, complaint procedures, and due process hearings. Principle 5 Individual

Education Program five has sub-categories: IEP team, written notice for IEP meeting, IEP content, transition, and other IEP requirements. Principle 6 Least Restrictive Environment is its own category.

School districts are notified nine months to a year prior to being monitored. Special Education Programs has an annual December training where districts send three to four staff members who are a part of the school's special education services program and possible members of the steering committee. At the training, districts learn who their team leaders are and take part in an overview of the monitoring process. Team leaders are educational specialists who contract with South Dakota Special Education Programs. The team leaders set up pre-onsite visits with each district to help prepare the school for the next year's onsite monitoring visit. The education specialists will conduct an IEP file review with each special education and related service provider at the pre-onsite visit. The education specialists will spend a minimum of one day with each district in preparation for the onsite monitoring visit.

In preparing to monitor districts, Special Education Programs provides each district that is to be monitored a set of state data tables which include the following information: general district demographics, district instructional staff, suspension and expulsion, statewide assessment, enrollment, placement alternatives, disabling conditions, service exiting, placement by age, placement by disabling condition, early intervention (Part C) exits, complaints, hearings, and monitoring. The district uses the data tables to complete their self assessment. The self assessment and data tables are reviewed by assigned educational specialist team leaders.

After a school has been monitored, the team leader writes a district report and sends it for review to Special Education Programs. Special Education Programs either approves or disapproves the report; if the report is disapproved it is sent back to the team leaders, corrected and then approved. Once the report has been approved, a copy is sent to the district, as well as the team leader. If necessary, the district and team leader work together to write an Improvement Plan Progress Report (IPPR). Once written, it is sent to Special Education Programs for approval. After approval, the district has 6 months to correct noncompliance before the first Improvement Plan Progress Report is due. Any noncompliance issues unmet after the 6 month Improvement Plan Progress Report move to the 12 month Improvement Plan Progress Report. At the 12 month Improvement Plan Progress Report districts are expected to be in compliance. Through Office of Special Education Program's clarification on what constitutes one year, Special Education Programs will begin the 12 month timeline as soon as districts are notified of findings of noncompliance instead of after the approval of the Improvement Plan Progress Report. Previously, Special Education Programs did not count the summer months as part of the year in which districts have to complete out of compliance issues. This will be corrected for the current monitoring cycle.

South Dakota had a staff of 1 director and 3 regional staff representatives in 2003-2004. This number is half of a full staff for Special Education Programs. The 3 Special Education Programs staff were regional representatives. They answered daily technical assistance questions via phone calls and email for 1/3 of the state's school districts, participated in complaint investigations, participated in onsite compliance monitoring, prepared presentations for state conferences as well as district requested presentations, sat on various boards in the state, and worked on special projects. One of the Special Education Programs staff monitoring duties is to review the Improvement Plan Progress Report (IPPR) at the six month due date and notify the district, by letter, which areas were accepted as being met and which areas still need to be met.

Once all findings of non-compliance have been met, Special Education Programs notified the district by mail that all areas in the Improvement Plan Progress Reports had been satisfactorily met.

South Dakota will conduct data reviews to incorporate the new indicators within the current monitoring system for the year 2005-2006. Any district with noncompliance findings occurring from the data review will warrant further in-depth review by Special Education Programs. South Dakota has formed a partnership with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring to help analyze data and to explore focused monitoring areas. South Dakota intends to modify the current monitoring system after the five year cycle is complete (2006-2007).

In an effort to ensure that districts are in compliance within one year after the issuance of the monitoring report, Special Education Programs will have districts send in progress reports at four months, eight months and twelve months. Special Education Programs staff will have regular contact with districts between the eighth and twelfth month in order to assure compliance within one year.

With the assistance of our partner, the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, South Dakota will develop their Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process to include a focused monitoring piece. This focused piece will include some of the monitoring priority indicators. Priority areas will need to be established based upon a district's level of compliance and greatest need.

South Dakota will continue to address findings of noncompliance through the self-assessment tool, onsite monitoring, data review and the Improvement Plan Progress Report. Districts will continue to identify their own noncompliance findings during the self-assessment process. Onsite monitoring will either validate or not validate the district's compliance and noncompliance issues. Education Specialists will continue to assist the districts in developing their Improvement Plan Progress Report based on any noncompliance issues from the onsite monitoring as well as data reviews completed by Special Education Program staff. The districts will complete all noncompliance monitoring findings within one year from the date of notification.

The South Dakota Accountability system includes a process of identifying LEAs with specific noncompliance issues based upon the components of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report Data resulting in a focused review. The system also includes a general process for selecting a variety of other LEAs to participate in a general supervision review of the districts policies and procedures.

Additional Information Regarding General Supervision Process from 2007-2008

Off-site or On-site Review

A variety of processes will be used to analyze and verify data and respond to noncompliance findings. SEP will determine if an off-site or on-site visit is necessary based upon desk audit results, district level of determinations, self-assessment data, complaints/due process hearings, uncorrected noncompliance, lack of improvement on performance indicators or other areas determined by Special Education Programs.

Data Sources

The Department of Education (DOE) has in place the Student Information Management System (SIMS) to collect statewide data. The data system is designed to capture data that is required to be reported to the federal government (e.g. Part B 618 Data Tables). Data is also captured through SEP web based systems and excel reports. Data sources accessed through the accountability system include but are not limited to the following:

1. 618 Data (Federal Data Requirements)
2. Data System Reports (SPP data)
3. Self Assessment (annually)
4. CAP Tracking Log
5. Complaints/Dispute Data
6. Monitoring Reports
7. Data and Reports Submission Tracking Log
8. Personnel Report
9. Family Survey Data
10. Annual Performance Report (APR)
11. SEP Desk Audit
12. Child Count
13. Interviews
14. Surveys

Each LEA is responsible for developing procedures related to the data system, including steps to ensure accuracy and reliability of data, as well as the analysis. LEA procedures should address: 1) who is responsible for data entry and their specific responsibilities; 2) the process for reviewing data entered on a regular basis for accuracy and reliability; 3) the process for making corrections and responding to the SEP data verification form; 4) the process for generating data reports for use in identifying potential issues and related training and technical assistance needs; 5) looking at improving program performance; and 6) correcting and tracking progress on noncompliance issues.

Identification of Noncompliance

Through review and analysis of data, noncompliance can be identified through any or all of the accountability components. Noncompliance is identified through the SPP for each compliance indicator (target is 0% for Indicators 9 and 10, and 100% for Indicators 11, 12, 13, 15, and 20) for each LEA. The state consistently applies its definition of a finding of noncompliance for each compliance indicator for each LEA, requiring the development of a Corrective Action Plan.

Low Performance on Performance Indicators

Instances of low performance on performance indicators (e.g., Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14) are identified for each LEA. If a LEA's performance is less than the state established target for any performance indicator, the LEA may be required to develop a performance indicator improvement plan to improve progress toward meeting the state targets.

Baseline Data for FFY (2003-2004 Monitoring year) 2003:

- A. 80% of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- B. a. number of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators a. = 306
- b. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification b. = 245
- C. 0% of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:
- a. number of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas a. = 0
- b. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification b. = 0
- C. 0% of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:
- a. number of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms a. = 0
- b. number of findings of noncompliance made b. = 0
- c. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification c. = 0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

	# of findings of Noncompliance	# of Corrections W/I 1 Yr.	% of Corrections W/I 1 Yr.
2004-2005			
Referral/Evaluation/Eligibility/Placement	71		
Procedural Safeguards	53		
IEP	125		
Least Restrictive Environment	2		
Total	251	208	83%

- South Dakota Special Education Programs monitored 36 districts in 2004-2005. In those 36 districts monitored there were 251 findings of noncompliance. 208 findings were corrected within 12 months of the approval of the district's Improvement Plan Progress Report. Of the remaining 43 findings, all findings were corrected by the time this State Performance Plan was submitted
- 30 of the 36 districts corrected their noncompliance findings within 12 months of the approval of the districts Improvement Plan Progress Report. Of the remaining 6 districts, all the districts corrected their noncompliance findings by the time this State Performance Plan was submitted.

2003-2004	# of findings of Noncompliance	# of Corrections W/I 1 Yr.	% of Corrections W/I 1 Yr.
Referral/Evaluation/Eligibility/Placement	165	136	82%
Procedural Safeguards	10	9	90%
IEP	127	98	77%
Least Restrictive Environment	4	2	50%
Total	306	245	80%

- South Dakota Special Education Programs monitored 34 districts in 2003-2004. In those 34 districts monitored there were 306 findings of noncompliance. 245 findings were corrected within 12 months of the approval of the district's Improvement Plan Progress Report. Of the remaining 61 findings, 27 findings were corrected by the time this State Performance Plan was submitted and the remaining 34 findings will be corrected by the end of December 2005.
- 23 of the 34 districts corrected their noncompliance findings within 12 months of the approval of the districts Improvement Plan Progress Report. Of the remaining 11 districts, 7 districts corrected their noncompliance findings by the time this State Performance Plan was submitted. The remaining 4 districts will be closed by the end of December 2005.
- 80% of South Dakota's findings of noncompliance were corrected within 12 months.
- South Dakota does have policies and procedures in place for districts that address noncompliance.
- Some of the technical assistance that Special Education Programs have provided includes onsite workshops and trainings for district special education staff, assisting district personnel in updating forms and district procedures, and access to education specialists and Transition Service Liaison personnel.

Special Education Programs has studied the data and has identified the following:

- South Dakota Special Education Programs has determined that losing half of the Special Education Programs staff was a significant barrier for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. With only 3 staff people to complete the Improvement monitoring and subsequent follow-through on progress, Special Education Programs found it difficult to keep up with the Improvement Plan Progress Report timelines as well as complete all other required duties. As of September 2005 Special Education Programs is now fully staffed. Special Education Programs has 1 director and 6 program staff. Having a full staff will help to ensure that Improvement Plan Progress Report timelines are followed.
- Some districts have such a small student population they were not able to complete some of the noncompliance issues within the 12 month timeframe because they may not have had another student to show they were completing the process accurately. An

example of this may be in the area of procedural safeguards: a student and parent must be informed of transfer of parental rights one year before the student turns 18. A district may not have another student who is turning 17 within the 12 month timeframe. In the future, South Dakota will ensure that all evidence of change will be required to be completed within one year. To ensure districts being able to close out in 12 months, Special Education Programs will have districts review, revise and implement their policies and procedures to show evidence of change.

- The monitoring timeline did not start until the Improvement Plan Progress Report was approved by Special Education Programs. This timeline will change for the current monitoring cycle. The 12 month timeline will begin as soon as districts receive the letter from Special Education Program stating the areas of noncompliance. This will require Education Specialists, district special education directors, and Special Education Program staff to work quickly to complete the district's Improvement Plan Progress Report within 12 months of receiving the letter of identified noncompliance. Special Education Programs will implement this through OSEPs clarifications on what constitutes a year.
- The monitoring timeline did not include the summer months because no schools were in session during this time. South Dakota will now include summer months within the 12 month timeline.
- South Dakota is looking at the current monitoring data Special Education Programs collects in order to find ways to focus our monitoring efforts related to the Part B SPP/APR Monitoring Priorities and Indicators. Special Education Programs will be using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) document Part B Monitoring Related Requirements and Investigative Questions Table as well as our National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) partner to assist with this process.

Statewide and local monitoring data will be reviewed so that technical assistance is aligned with systemic issues identified through monitoring

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year

2008 (2008-2009)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year
2012 (2011-2013)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Formed a partnership with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring	September 2005 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialists, Transition Services Liaison Project staff, National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education
Notify all monitored districts that all noncompliance issues must be completed within one year	January 2006 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialists, Transition Services Liaison Project staff
Partner with NCSEAM to facilitate analyzing state monitoring data	July 2006 Completed	Special Education Program staff Educational Specialist, Transition Services Liaison Project staff, National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education

Revise current monitoring system to include all indicators and noncompliance areas identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.)	Winter and Spring 2007 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialist, Transition Services Liaison Project staff, National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education
Develop new forms for tracking Monitoring data, Improvement Plan Progress Report data, & district correspondence. SEP staff will input Improvement Plan Progress Report dates into their calendar and will complete Improvement Plan Progress Report follow-up as scheduled.	August 2006 Completed August 2006 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialist, Transition Services Liaison Project staff Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialist, Transition Services Liaison Project staff
Training to districts on revised monitoring system	September 2007 and annually through 2009 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialist, National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education
Update Technical Assistance Manuals such as Surrogate Parent, Extended School Year, IEP, etc. Provide presentations and trainings	Beginning fall of 2006 Winter and Spring 2007 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education, South Dakota Parent Connection
Require technical assistance to all districts/agencies that are not close to compliance by their ninth month Improvement Plan Progress	2006 and ongoing through 2013	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialists, Transition Services Liaison Project staff

Report.		
Look at implementing incentives for districts/agencies that close out at 3 months and 6 months.	2007 and ongoing through 2008 Completed	Special Education Program staff, Educational Specialists, Transition Services Liaison Project staff. Accountability Manual describes incentives.
Provide technical assistance to districts the year before they are monitored.	2008 Completed	SEP staff, district personnel, stakeholder workgroup
Train the Trainer Technical Assistance (IEP Workshops)	2008 and ongoing through 2013	SEP staff and contracted technical assistance providers, TAESE
Provide Public and Private Agencies IEP Regulations training	2008 and ongoing through 2013	SEP staff, public and private agency staff, education specialists

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota uses the following procedures to respond to signed written complaints. The procedures will be revised pending final Part B regulations.

A complaint is a written signed statement by an individual or organization, including a complaint filed by an individual or organization from another state containing a statement that the state education agency or a school district has violated a requirement of federal or state statutes or regulations that apply to a program and a statement of the facts on which the complaint is based.

In resolving the complaint in which the State Special Education Programs has found a failure to provide appropriate services, the State Special Education Programs, pursuant to its general supervisory authority under Part B of the IDEA, must address:

1. How to remediate the denial of those services, including, as appropriate, the awarding of monetary reimbursement or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the child; and
2. Appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities.

The special education state director appoints a complaint investigation team. The team may conduct an on-site investigation if it determines that one is necessary. The complaint team shall

give the complainant the opportunity to submit additional information, either orally or in writing, about the allegations in the complaint. The complaint team makes a recommendation to the special education state director, and after reviewing all relevant information, the special education state director shall determine whether the complaint is valid. The special education state director shall submit a written report of the final decision to all parties involved, including findings of fact, conclusions, and reasons for final decision.

All complaints must be resolved within 60 calendar days after the receipt of the complaint by the special education state director as stated in this section. An extension of the 60 day time limit may be granted only if exceptional circumstances exist with respect to a particular complaint. This section does not limit any other rights to appeals, including appeal to the state board; however, these appeals may not be used for delay or to extend time limits.

If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing, or contains multiple issues, of which one or more are part of that hearing, the State Special Education Programs must set aside any part of the complaint that is being addressed in the due process hearing, until the conclusion of the hearing. However, any issue in the complaint that is not a part of the due process action must be resolved using the time limit and procedures described in this section.

If an issue is raised in a complaint filed under this section that has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties:

1. The hearing decision is binding; and
2. The State Special Education must inform the complainant to that effect.

A complaint alleging a district's failure to implement a due process hearing decision must be resolved by the State Special Education Program

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Data collected on Attachment 1

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	1
(a) Reports with findings	1
(b) Reports within timeline	1
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

South Dakota received one signed, written complaints for FFY 2004. The complaint was investigated and a report issued within the 60 day timeline, findings of facts were issued and a corrective action was completed. South Dakota Special Education Programs, South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy services work very hard to make sure parents have information on all areas of educating their child with a disability including knowledge of procedural safeguards. A very active training program for parents of children with disabilities is Partners in Policy Making. Partners in Policymaking is an innovative leadership and advocacy training opportunity designed to involve and empower people with developmental disabilities, parents of children with disabilities and other family members. It requires a serious commitment by each participant during the course of the training, as well as after graduation. The expectation is that each Partner will commit to actively use the skills learned to encourage positive changes in the areas of community awareness, sensitivity, accessibility, and inclusion for people with disabilities. Over 225 individuals have graduated from Partners in Policymaking in South Dakota since the program began in the fall of 1992 through the fall of 2005. An added benefit of the training is that graduates assist others with the knowledge they have gained.

Special Education Programs in partnership with South Dakota Parent Connection have also established the Navigator Program. The purpose of the South Dakota Navigator Program is to provide individualized technical assistance, information, and support services to families and educators caring for children with special education needs. A Navigator Program Coordinator will organize and manage these activities and oversee the “Peer Navigators” located in each of the seven Educational Services Areas (ESAs) as defined by the South Dakota Department of Education. These “Peer Navigators” are recruited from such areas as Partners in Policymaking graduates, experienced educators, and recently retired educational administrators. Goals of the program include:

- Improve family-school collaboration
- Provide an additional mechanism for conflict-resolution at a local level
- Provide resources for educators and parents in areas of technical assistance and leadership development
- Promote the knowledge of benefits derived from increased family involvement to school personnel

Resulting in productive IEP meetings and promoting respectful interactions between families and school personnel in order to make the best decisions regarding each student’s educational program. South Dakota Parent Connection also answers between 200 – 300 calls monthly and has a web-based bulletin board for parents to post questions and get answers.

Special Education Programs feels that because of the efforts of Special Education Programs, South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy South Dakota parents become better informed each year.

FFY 2011: This indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR. States report data on the timeliness of State complaint decisions as part of the data they submit under IDEA section 618.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints will be investigated and have reports issued within the 60-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extension for exceptional circumstances.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of signed written complaints will be investigated and have reports issued within the 60-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extension for exceptional circumstances.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints will be investigated and have reports issued within the 60-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extension for exceptional circumstances.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or

	organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>South Dakota Special Education Programs staff will review all procedures for conducting complaint investigations.</p> <p>Training and technical assistance is provided to ensure complaint investigators follow the procedural requirements under IDEA.</p>	<p>2006 and ongoing through 2013</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>Special Education Programs staff, the Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) Contracted Complaint Investigators</p>
<p>Special Education Programs will supply a complaint form on the web for easy access by individuals.</p>	<p>Spring 2006 Completed</p>	<p>Special Education Program staff</p>
<p>The complaint investigation handbook will be updated following IDEA 2004 final regulations.</p>	<p>2006 – 2007 school year Completed</p>	<p>Special Education Programs staff, TAESE</p>
<p>A protocol will be maintained by Special Education Programs to ensure timelines and procedures are followed for complaint investigations.</p>	<p>2006 and ongoing through 2013</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>Special Education Programs staff</p>

The state agency will contract with TAESE in the development of a system of complaint investigators who will contract with the state agency to facilitate complaint investigations.	2006 and ongoing through 2013 Completed	Special Education Programs staff, TAESE
Update and disseminate Special Education Programs website and complaint investigation manual.	2006 and ongoing through 2013 Completed	Special Education Programs staff, TAESE, Parent Connections
Partner with Parent Connections to provide training and materials for parent procedural safeguard workshops.	2007 and ongoing through 2013 Completed	Special Education Programs staff, TAESE, Parent Connections
Utilize data from Navigator Program to determine what training should be held.	2008 and ongoing through 2013 Revised as new activity (below)	State staff will gather data from a variety of sources from Parent Connections.
SEP and SD Advocacy will meet to discuss areas of need and analyze data.	2009 and ongoing through 2013 Revised as new activity (below)	SEP and South Dakota Advocacy
Data from the Navigator Program, SD Parent Connections, and SD Advocacy will be utilized by SEP in determining training needs	New 2011 and ongoing through 2013	SEP, Parent Connections, SD Advocacy

Due to input from our stakeholder's group, Special Education Programs is working on a brochure for the complaint process that would be part of a packet on dispute resolution that includes state complaints, due process hearings – resolution sessions, and mediations.	2007-2008 Completed	Special Education Programs in conjunction with legal counsel, the office of hearing examiners, consultants and stakeholders.
---	----------------------------	--

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota data reflects that the general supervision procedures for due process hearings identify and correct noncompliance in a timely manner. The limited number of hearings also indicates the State uses the system effectively to ensure the provision of appropriate services to students in need of special education. Procedures will be revised pending final IDEA 2004 language.

The district must have procedures that require either party, parent or district, or the attorney representing a party, to provide to the other party a due process complaint (which must remain confidential).

The party filing a due process complaint must forward a copy of the due process complaint to the State Special Education Programs.

The due process complaint notice must include:

1. The name of the child;
2. The address of the residence of the child;
3. The name of the school the child is attending;
4. In the case of a homeless child or youth (within the meaning of section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a(2)), available contact information for the child, and the name of the school the child is attending;
5. A description of the nature of the problem of the child relating to the proposed or refused initiation or change, including facts relating to the problem; and

6.A proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the party at the time.

The State Special Education Programs has developed a model form to assist parents in filing a compliant and due process complaint notice.

A party, parent or district, may not have a hearing on a due process complaint or engage in a resolution session until the party, or the attorney representing the party, files a due process complaint that meets the requirements of this section.

The due process complaint required by this section must be deemed sufficient unless the party, parent or district, receiving the due process complaint notifies the hearing officer and the other party in writing, within 15 days of receipt of the due process complaint, that the receiving party believes the due process complaint does not meet the requirements of this section.

Within five days of receipt of the above notification, the hearing officer must make a determination on the face of the due process complaint of whether the due process complaint meets the requirements of this section, and must immediately notify the parties in writing of that determination.

A party may amend its due process complaint only if:

- 1.The other party consents in writing to the amendment and is given the opportunity to resolve the due process complaint through a resolution session; or
- 2.The hearing officer grants permission, except that the hearing officer may only grant permission to amend at any time not later than five days before the due process hearing begins.

The applicable timeline for a due process hearing under Part B shall recommence at the time the party files an amended notice, including the timeline for a resolution session.

If the district has not sent a prior written notice under Part B of IDEA to the parent regarding the subject matter contained in the parent's due process complaint, the district must, within 10 days of receiving the due process complaint, send to the parent a response that includes:

- 1.An explanation of why the district proposed or refused to take the action raised in the due process complaint;
- 2.A description of other options that the IEP Team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;
- 3.A description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the district used as the basis for the proposed or refused action; and
- 4.A description of the other factors that are relevant to the district's proposed or refused action.

A response by a district under this section shall not be construed to preclude the district from asserting that the parent's due process complaint was insufficient, where appropriate.

Except as provided above, the party receiving a due process complaint must, within 10 days of receiving the due process complaint, send to the other party a response that specifically addresses the issues raised in the due process complaint.

The parent or the school district may initiate a hearing on any matters relating to the identification, evaluation or educational placement of a child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child.

The party, parent or district, requesting the due process hearing may not raise issues at the due process hearing that were not raised in the due process complaint unless the other party agrees otherwise.

When a hearing is initiated, the district shall inform the party of the availability of mediation. If the parent is requesting a hearing or requests information on any free or low-cost legal services, the district shall inform the parent of it and any other relevant services available in the area.

A parent or district must request an impartial hearing on their due process complaint within two years of the date the parent or district knew or should have known about the alleged action that forms the basis of the due process complaint, or if the State has an explicit time limitation for requesting such a due process hearing under Part B of IDEA, in the time allowed by State law.

The timeline described above does not apply to a parent if the parent was prevented from filing a due process complaint due to:

1. Specific misrepresentations by the district that it had resolved the problem forming the basis of the due process complaint; or
2. The district's withholding of information from the parent that was required under Part B of IDEA to be provided to the parent.

At a minimum, a hearing officer:

1. Must not be:
 - a. An employee of the State Department of Education or the district that is involved in the education or care of the child; or
 - b. A person having a personal or professional interest that conflicts with the person's objectivity in the hearing;
2. Must possess knowledge of, and the ability to understand, the provisions of IDEA, Federal and State regulations pertaining to IDEA, and legal interpretations of IDEA by Federal and State courts;
3. Must possess the knowledge and ability to conduct hearings in accordance with appropriate, standard legal practice; and
4. Must possess the knowledge and ability to render and write decisions in accordance with appropriate, standard legal practice.

A person who otherwise qualifies to conduct a hearing under this section is not an employee of the agency solely because he or she is paid by the agency to serve as a hearing officer. The State Special Education Programs and district shall keep a list of the persons who

serve as hearing officers. The list must include a statement of the qualifications of each of those persons.

Any party to a hearing has the right to:

1. Be accompanied and advised by counsel and by individuals with special knowledge or training with respect to the problems of children with disabilities;
2. Present evidence and confront cross-examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses;
3. Prohibit the introduction of any evidence at the hearing that has not been disclosed to that party at least 5 business days before the hearing;
4. Obtain a written, or, at the option of the parents, electronic, verbatim record of the hearing; and
5. Obtain written, or, at the option of the parents, electronic findings of fact and decisions.

At least 5 business days prior to a hearing, each party shall disclose to all other parties all evaluations completed by that date and recommendations based on the offering party's evaluations that the party intends to use at the hearing.

A hearing officer may bar any party that fails to comply with the disclosure requirements of this section from introducing the relevant evaluation or recommendation at the hearing without the consent of the other party.

A parent involved the hearings, have the right to:

1. Have the child who is the subject of the hearing present; and
2. Open the hearing to the public.

Subject to this section, a hearing officer must make a decision on substantive grounds based on a determination of whether the child received a FAPE.

In matters alleging a procedural violation, a hearing officer may find that a child did not receive a FAPE only if the procedural inadequacies:

1. Impeded the child's right to a FAPE;
2. Significantly impeded the parents' opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding the provision of a FAPE to the parents' child; or
3. Caused a deprivation of educational benefit.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a hearing officer from ordering a district to comply with procedural requirements in this document.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a parent from filing a separate due process complaint on an issue separate from a due process complaint already filed.

The record of the hearing and the findings of fact and decisions must be provided at no cost to the parent.

The State Special Education Programs, after deleting any personally identifiable information, shall transmit the findings and decisions to the State advisory panel, and make those findings and decisions available to the public.

A decision made in a hearing is final, except that any party involved in the hearing may appeal the decision through civil action.

The State Special Education Programs and district shall ensure that not later than 45 days after the expiration of the 30 day period regarding a resolution session:

1. A final decision is reached in the hearing; and
2. A copy of the decision is mailed to each of the parties.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	4
(3.1) Resolution sessions	
(a) Settlement agreements	NO 04-05 DATA
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	4

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	NO 2004- 2005 DATA
(a) Settlement agreements	NO 2004- 2005 DATA
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Special Education Programs received 4 due process hearing complaints during the 2004-2005 year. One was dismissed due to the fact that the family left the state before the hearing could take place. Two due process hearing complaints were successfully mediated. One was dismissed at the request of both parties.

South Dakota has a history of limited due process hearings and a strong commitment to resolution before litigation. South Dakota remains at 100% in fully adjudicating due process hearings within the timeline. South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy services work very hard to make sure parents have information on all areas of educating their child with a disability including knowledge of procedural safeguards. A very active training program for parents of children with disabilities is Partners in Policy Making. Partners in Policymaking is an innovative leadership and advocacy training opportunity designed to involve and empower people with developmental disabilities, parents of children with disabilities and other family members. It requires a serious commitment by each participant during the course of the training, as well as after graduation. The expectation is that each Partner will commit to actively use the skills learned to encourage positive changes in the areas of community awareness, sensitivity, accessibility, and inclusion for people with disabilities. Over 225 individuals have graduated from Partners in Policymaking in South Dakota since the program began in the fall of 1992. An added benefit of the training is that graduates assist others with the knowledge they have gained.

Special Education Programs in partnership with South Dakota Parent Connection have also established the Navigator Program. The purpose of the South Dakota Navigator Program is to provide individualized technical assistance, information, and support services to families and educators caring for children with special education needs. A Navigator Program Coordinator will organize and manage these activities and oversee the “Peer Navigators” located in each of the seven Educational Services Areas (ESAs) as defined by the South Dakota Department of Education. These “Peer Navigators” are recruited from such areas as Partners in Policymaking graduates, experienced educators, and recently retired educational administrators. Goals of the program include:

- Improve family-school collaboration
- Provide an additional mechanism for conflict-resolution at a local level
- Provide resources for educators and parents in areas of technical assistance and leadership development
- Promote the knowledge of benefits derived from increased family involvement to school personnel

Resulting in productive IEP meetings and promoting respectful interactions between families and school personnel in order to make the best decisions regarding each student’s educational program. South Dakota Parent Connection also answers between 200 – 300 calls monthly and has a web-based bulletin board for parents to post questions and get answers.

Special Education Programs feels that because of the efforts of Special Education Programs, South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy South Dakota parents become better informed each year.

FFY 2011: This indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR. States report data on the timeliness of State due process hearing decisions as part of the data they submit under IDEA section 618.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of due process hearings will be completed within the 45-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extended for exceptional purposes.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of due process hearings will be completed within the 45-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extended for exceptional purposes.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of due process hearings will be completed within the 45-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extended for exceptional purposes.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources
The state will monitor the hearing process and timelines to ensure maintenance of 100% adjudication.	2005 and ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs staff ,Legal Assistant for the department, Office of Hearing Examiners, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education staff consultation
Update Administrative Rules for South Dakota concerning due process hearings and resolution sessions when final federal regulations are complete.	Fall 2007 completed	Special Education Programs staff, legal consultant, Advisory Panel, Legislative Research Council
Provide training for legal assistant for the department concerning the updated regulations.	Fall 2006 completed	Special Education Programs staff, Legal Counsel for DOE, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education
Joint training for Districts and parents on procedural safeguards	Fall 2006 and ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs staff, Legal Counsel for DOE, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education , Parent Connections
Due to input from our stakeholder's group, Special Education Programs is working on a brochure for due process hearings, including resolution sessions, which would be part of a packet on dispute resolution that includes state complaints, due process hearings – resolution sessions, and mediations.	2007-2008 Completed	Special Education Programs in conjunction with legal counsel, the office of hearing examiners, consultants and stakeholders.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Measurement:

Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota has a system in place to track hearing requests, timelines and outcomes. As a new requirement of IDEA 2004, South Dakota's procedure addressing hearing requests will require the due process procedures to include resolution sessions. The South Dakota State Department will modify the current process for requesting hearings to include resolution sessions. The resolution sessions are required unless the parent and the school agree to waive the session or go to mediation. The procedures will be revised pending final Part B regulations.

Within 15 days of receiving notice of the parents' due process complaint, and prior to the opportunity for a due process hearing, the district must convene a meeting with the parents and the relevant member or members of the IEP team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the due process complaint that:

1. Includes a representative of the district who has decision-making authority on behalf of the district; and
2. May not include an attorney of the district unless the parent is accompanied by an attorney.

The purpose of the meeting is for the parents of the child to discuss their due process complaint, and the facts that form the basis of the due process complaint, so that the district has the opportunity to resolve the complaint.

The meeting described above need not be held if:

1. The parents and the district agree in writing to waive the meeting; or

2. The parents and the district agree to use the mediation process described in this document.

If the district has not resolved the due process complaint to the satisfaction of the parents within 30 days of the receipt of the due process complaint, the due process hearing must occur and all applicable timelines for a due process hearing shall commence.

Except where the parties have jointly agreed to waive the resolution process or to use mediation, the failure of a parent filing a due process complaint to participate in the resolution meeting will delay the timelines for the resolution process and due process hearing until the meeting is held.

If a resolution to the dispute is reached at the meeting described above, the parent and district must execute a legally binding agreement that is:

1. Signed by both the parent and a representative of the agency who has the authority to bind the district; and
2. Enforceable in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

If the parent and district execute an agreement, either may void the agreement within 3 business days of the agreement's execution.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10 in a reporting period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

South Dakota had two requests for due process hearings during the 2005 – 2006 school year. Both parties agreed to waive the resolution session in favor of mediation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2006 (2006-2007)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2007 (2007-2008)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2008 (2008-2009)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2009 (2009-2010)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2010 (2010-2011)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2011 (2011-2012)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10
2012 (2012-2013)	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: No improvement activities required.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota has a system in place for voluntary mediation, available at all levels of disputes and may be waived by either party.

South Dakota data reflects the general supervision procedures for mediation. Trained staff gives priority to meeting the deadlines. The limited number of mediations indicates the state uses the system effectively to ensure the provision of appropriate services to students in need of special education. The procedures will be revised pending final Part B regulations.

The State shall ensure that procedures are established and implemented to allow parties to disputes involved in the proposal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation or education placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child, including matters that arise prior to the filing of a due process hearing, to resolve the disputes through a mediation process.

The mediation procedures must ensure that participation is voluntary on the part of the parties. Mediation may not be used to deny or delay the parent's right to a due process hearing or to deny any other rights afforded under Part B of the Act. It must be conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediators are selected on a random basis.

The State Special Education Programs shall maintain a list of individuals who are qualified mediators and knowledgeable in laws and regulations relating to the provision of special education and related services. An individual who serves as a mediator may not be an employee of the school district or State agency providing services to the child. They must not have a personal or professional conflict of interest. The State will bear the cost of the mediation process.

A person who otherwise qualifies as a mediator is not an employee of a district or State agency solely because he or she is paid by the State Special Education Programs to serve as a mediator.

Each session in the mediation process must be scheduled in a timely manner and must be held in a location that is convenient to the parties to the dispute. An agreement reached by the parties to the dispute in the mediation must be set forth in a written mediation agreement.

Discussions that occur during the mediation process must be confidential and may not be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings. The parties to the mediation process may be required to sign a confidentiality pledge prior to the beginning of the process.

If the parties resolve a dispute through the mediation process, the parties must execute a legally binding agreement that sets forth that resolution and that:

1. States that all discussions that occurred during the mediation process will remain confidential and may not be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearing or civil proceeding arising from that dispute; and
2. Is signed by both the parent and a representative of the district who has the authority to bind such district.

A written, signed mediation agreement under this section is enforceable in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

If a parent chooses not to use the mediation process, the school district or a State agency providing services to the child may establish procedures to offer the parent and to the district an opportunity to meet, at a time and location convenient to both parties, with a disinterested party, to encourage the use and explain the benefits of the mediation process. This party may be under contract with a parent training and information center, community parent resource center established in the state or with an appropriate alternative dispute resolution entity.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	3
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	3
(i) Mediation agreements	2
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	1

Discussion of Baseline Data:

South Dakota had three mediation sessions based on due process complaints during the 2004-2005 year. Two were successfully mediated and one was dismissed at the request of both parties.

With regards to mediation, South Dakota's data reflects an effective mediation system, with all mediations reported resulting in successful agreements. South Dakota also makes informal mediation (not related to a hearing request) available as well. The impact of the mediation system can be seen in the due process hearing data, which reflects that all hearing requests were successfully mediated. Special Education Programs, South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy work very hard to make sure parents have information on all areas of educating their child with a disability including knowledge of procedural safeguards. South Dakota Advocacy has estimated that between 2002 through 2004 approximately 1200 people have received some type of training regarding special education. A very active training program for parents of children with disabilities is Partners in Policy Making. Partners in Policymaking is an innovative leadership and advocacy training opportunity designed to involve and empower people with developmental disabilities, parents of children with disabilities and other family members. It requires a serious commitment by each participant during the course of the training, as well as after graduation. The expectation is that each Partner will commit to actively use the skills learned to encourage positive changes in the areas of community awareness, sensitivity, accessibility, and inclusion for people with disabilities. Over 225 individuals have graduated from Partners in Policymaking in South Dakota since the program began in the fall of 1992. An added benefit of the training is that graduates assist others with the knowledge they have gained.

Special Education Programs in partnership with South Dakota Parent Connection have also established the Navigator Program. The purpose of the South Dakota Navigator Program is to provide individualized technical assistance, information, and support services to families and educators caring for children with special education needs. A Navigator Program Coordinator will organize and manage these activities and oversee the "Peer Navigators" located in each of the seven Educational Services Areas (ESAs) as defined by the South Dakota Department of Education. These "Peer Navigators" are recruited from such areas as Partners in Policymaking graduates, experienced educators, and recently retired educational administrators. Goals of the program include:

- Improve family-school collaboration
- Provide an additional mechanism for conflict-resolution at a local level
- Provide resources for educators and parents in areas of technical assistance and leadership development
- Promote the knowledge of benefits derived from increased family involvement to school personnel

Resulting in productive IEP meetings and promoting respectful interactions between families and school personnel in order to make the best decisions regarding each student's educational program. South Dakota Parent Connection also answers between 200 – 300 calls monthly and has a web-based bulletin board for parents to post questions and get answers.

Special Education Programs feels that because of the efforts of Special Education Programs, South Dakota Parent Connection and South Dakota Advocacy South Dakota parents become better informed each year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2006 (2006-2007)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2007 (2007-2008)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2008 (2008-2009)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2009 (2009-2010)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2010 (2010-2011)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2011 (2011-2012)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations
2012 (2012-2013)	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources
South Dakota tracks mediations to ensure timelines and procedures are followed.	Ongoing data collection and analysis from 2006-2013	Mediation training for Special Education Programs staff, Legal counsel for the Special Education Programs staff, Office of Hearing Examiners, TAESE staff
Conduct trainings for school	Fall 2006 and ongoing	South Dakota Parent Connection, Special

personnel and parents to utilize the Navigator Program. This program specializes in connecting a resource person with parents/guardians to assist them through the IEP process.	through 2013	Education Programs staff
Train district representatives in conflict resolution to assist with the resolution session requirement of IDEA 2004	September 2006 and ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs staff, SD Parent Connection, CADRE
Recruit additional mediators	Summer 2006 and ongoing through 2013	Special Education Programs staff, Education Service Agencies, Educational Specialists
Conduct training for new and continuing mediators	Summer 2006 and ongoing through 2013 as needed	Contract mediation trainers
Data manager has created step by step protocol for the collection of child count data along with other data collections and reporting.	February 2006 and updates on-going as data collection changes	Special Education Staff, Office of Data Collection Staff
All districts are sent data on State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report to be reviewed and verified to ensure all data reported is accurate for state and district reporting	January 2007 and on-going	Special Education Programs, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See page 1 of the State Performance Plan.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and**
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).**

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

South Dakota has a state wide reporting system, SIMS, which provides data for February 1 child count and exiting reports. South Dakota requires Districts to submit discipline data at the end of each school year. Personnel data is submitted annually through Special Education Personnel Summary. South Dakota submits the Annual Performance Report accurately and meets required time lines. South Dakota was chosen as one of the first states to enter data through EDEN because of past data accuracy and on time submission. South Dakota ensures accuracy by providing training on data entry.

Each school district reports through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) annually. The SIMS is the statewide online system used to collect information about all students in South Dakota schools. Districts submit data through the student data records. Each student has a 9 digit unique student identifier number. The unique student identifier number allows the SIMS system to collect and sort data without duplication errors. Each school district in South Dakota has a SIMS coordinator in place.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Timelines for 618 data and APR

South Dakota has been collecting and submitting timely 618 data reports. The Child Count, APR and LRE table 1 and table 3 have been submitted on or before February 1 each year. Exit table # 4 Personnel table #2 and Discipline #5 have been submitted on or before November 1st each of the previous years. South Dakota's data collection manager position has been vacant since August 2005. The position was filled October 24, 2005. In order to give adequate time for training and familiarization with the data collection process South Dakota requested and received an extension until December 1, 2005 for reporting Exit table # 4 Personnel table #2 and Discipline #5 for the November 1, 2005 collection.

Accuracy of data

South Dakota was notified by the U.S. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development that it was one of the first states excused from traditional reporting of IDEA data to U.S. Department of Education (ED) due to the high quality of South Dakota's EDEN submissions for SY 2003-04. South Dakota qualified to supply the data for the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B (Table 1) for SY 2005-06(OMB #1820-0043) and Exiting Special Education During the School Year (OMB number 1820-0521) exclusively through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN).

Due to the hiring of a new data manager for the South Dakota Department of Education, Special Education Programs may not be able to submit data through EDEN. South Dakota's submission will depend upon the training of the data manager on the EDEN system however; South Dakota will continue to submit through the normal process.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

South Dakota Special Education Programs will continue to submit timely and accurate data collection and submission.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on

	time.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100% will be submitted on time.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Training for new data manager	Beginning October 24, 2005 / on going through 2007 Completed	Westat data collection training video, Part B/C data managers conference, Harcourt training on assessment data, training with Infinite Campus on state wide student management collection system (SIMS)
All districts are sent data on State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report to be reviewed and verified to ensure all data reported is accurate for state and district reporting	January 2007 and on-going Completed FFY 2010	Special Education Programs staff
Data manager has created step by step protocol for the collection of child count data	February 2006 and updates on-going as data collection changes	Office of Finance and Management staff, Infinite Campus, Special Education

along with other data collections and reporting.	Completed FFY 2010	Programs staff
In order to ensure fidelity of the process and the validity and reliability of the data, the SEA will train district SIMS coordinators on an annual basis. The training will cover accurate data entry and timeline requirements and focus on changes to the data entry system and errors that have been identified through data analysis. This annual training will maintain the accuracy and timeliness of data submissions.	2006 and ongoing through 2013	Office of Finance and Management staff, Infinite Campus, Special Education Programs staff
Special Education Programs will obtain previous, current and future data from data manager; to be stored on a common shared drive. (SPED Profiles)	Spring 2006 and ongoing through 2013 Completed FFY 2010	Special Education Program staff, Office of Finance and Management staff
Create a timeline for all parties involved who collect data; to ensure timely and accurate data collection	Summer 2006 and updated annually through 2013 Completed FFY 2010	Special Education Program staff, district representatives, Office of Finance and Management staff